

The CASE of the ROYAL MARTYR
Considered with CANDOUR;

OR, AN

A N S W E R

T O

SOME LIBELS

Lately Published

In Prejudice to the MEMORY of
that UNFORTUNATE PRINCE;

Particularly to

- I. A Letter to a Clergyman, relating to his Sermon on the 30th of *January*: Being a complete Answer to all the Sermons that ever have been, or ever shall be, preached in the like Strain on that Anniversary.
- II. An Enquiry into the Share which King *Charles I.* had in the Transactions of the Earl of *Glamorgan*, &c. Wherein the *Conjectures* and *main Positions* of that Writer are shewn to be false, groundless, and by no Means reconcileable with the Character of a *Critic* or a *Scholar*.

Pro Rege sapie; pro Patriâ, pro prisâ Fide, semper.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

L O N D O N,

Printed: And sold by J. RICHARDSON in *Pater-noster-row*, and P. DAVEY and B. LAW in *Ave-mary-lane*.
MDCCLVIII.

S O M E

OBSERVATIONS

Upon a TREATISE, intitl'd,

An ENQUIRY into the Share which King Charles I. had in the Transactions of the Earl of GLAMORGAN, &c. for bringing over a Body of Irish Rebels to assist that King in the Years 1645 and 1646, &c.

HITHERTO I have been chiefly employ'd in obviating the Mistakes of Men, who, I think, I may now venture to say, appear to be either very ignorant of our History, or resolv'd to admit of no Facts, but what are agreeable to their own Way of Thinking—none but what are related by *Rebels* and *Regicides*, or found in the *Libels* and *Lampoons* of the most contemptible Scribblers. These Men I have been forced to trace through all the Mazes of Chicanery and Prevarication,—through such numerous *Misrepresentations*, *Falsehoods*, and *Forgeries*, as nothing but Party-Prejudice or impious Drollery — nothing but a *Ludlow* or an *Oldmixon*, &c. could have suggested or impos'd upon the World.

VOL. II.

B

I am

I am now, if I am rightly informed, to engage with a Gentleman of Sense and Learning—one who has read a good deal, and writ well—writ with Spirit, and Life, and Force, upon various Subjects—one who has been favoured with the Applause and Patronage of Persons of high Rank and Distinction, and is said to have done Justice to the Royal Martyr in a Point of Consequence *. Such a Writer has a Claim to Respect; and if he has inadvertently adopted some Mistakes, injurious to the Memory of that unfortunate Prince, they ought to be looked upon as *such*—they ought to be looked upon as *Mistakes*, not as wilful *Misrepresentations*, till good Proof is brought, that they were intended for that ungenerous Purpose.

But if it shall appear that the chief Proofs, which he has offered in Prejudice to his Majesty's Character, are manifest Forgeries, that the Use which he has made of them is utterly inconsistent with that Judgment, which a Man of Sense would form of them in any other Case; what must we think of a Writer, who is no Stranger to History, and yet, upon the Strength of *such Proofs*, hath advanced or insinuated Positions, which are an absolute Contradiction to the best Accounts that we have of *his Majesty*, and which the *Enquirer* must know to be *such*?

Writers of Credit, the *Enquirer* must know, agree, that King *Charles* was a Prince of great Abilities, and other excellent Accomplishments;

* See *Milton's Life*.

that he was a *wise*, a *virtuous*, a *zealous Protestant*. Now,

That a *zealous Protestant* should authorize, concur in, or be *privy* to Measures which might endanger the Safety of the *Protestant Religion*;

That a *wise*, a *virtuous* Prince, should be guilty of — should say and do the most *wicked*, *cruel*, *lawless*, *silly* Things;

That a Prince, who wrote as well as most Gentlemen of the Age in which he lived; who was remarkable for a Propriety of Diction, and a perspicuous, noble, manly Style, should write *vain*, *empty*, *foolish*, *trifling Letters*, in a Language *mean*, *tedious*, and *confused*;

That a *wise* and *intelligent* Prince should grant *Patents* and *Commissions* giving to Subjects Powers of such a *ridiculous*, *absurd* and *extravagant* Nature, as were never granted by the *weakest* Prince upon Earth;

That a *wise* and *intelligent* Prince should write Letters and grant *Patents* full of *Blunders*, *Inconsistencies*, and *Falsehoods*; and

That a *Scholar* and a *Critic* should ascribe such *Patents* and *Letters* to one of the best bred Gentlemen — one of the most polite and accomplished Princes in *Europe*; in a Word,

That a *Scholar* and a *Critic* should produce such Letters and *Patents*, to confront the united Testimonies of the most unprejudiced Historians, is something astonishing. But of this more afterwards.

The professed Design of this Author is to enquire into the Share which King *Charles I.* had

in the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, &c. for bringing over a Body of *Irish Rebels* to assist that King in the Years 1645 and 1646. The Method which he has taken to prepossess the Reader in Favour of his *Enquiry* is, I verily think, as extraordinary as any that is to be met with.

He has, in a very few Words, cut off all the Aids, which the Advocates for the *Royal Martyr* might expect from the Character which is given that Prince by the best Writers. He has, in Contradiction to their express Testimonies, insinuated,

That King *Charles* had few or none of those Virtues or Accomplishments, which are usually ascribed to him ;

That his Character was rather owing to his Sufferings, and the Confusions consequent thereupon, than to any real Merit of his own ; in short,

That he was neither a good Man, nor a zealous Protestant.——And what has the *Enquirer* offered in support of these Charges? Not a Syllable. He has indeed hinted, that all this will appear in the Progress of his Enquiry ; his Enquiry being *founded*, as he tells us, *upon a faithful Deduction of the best Authorities, and Evidences, which the Distance of Time, and the Nature of such secret Transactions, have suffered to come down to us.*

But if, on the other Hand, it shall appear that his *principal Foundation* — his very best Authorities and Evidences, are *arrant Forgeries*,
the

the Consequence will be plain and obvious—his whole conjectural Fabric must fall of Course, and the judicious Reader will find little or no Difficulty to pronounce upon the Design of that *Prefatory Artifice*, with which he endeavours to recommend his Performance to the World. Give me Leave therefore to examine the Evidences, which the *Enquirer* hath advanced, in Prejudice to the *Royal Martyr's* Character, and see how far they affect it. And here, that we may be able to judge of what he has offered in Proof of his main Positions, I shall, before I proceed to examine the Truth of them, lay before the Reader the full Force of what he calls a *faithful Deduction of the best Authorities and Evidences, which the Distance of Time, and the Nature of such secret Transactions, have suffered to come down to us.*

The *Enquirer*, in order to shew, that King Charles was privy to the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, and authorized him to bring over a Body of *Irish* Rebels to assist that King in the Years 1645 and 1646, tells us,

That the King gave the MARQUIS OF ORMOND Orders to make a Cessation of Arms with the *Irish* Rebels, and that the Cessation was concluded on the 15th of September 1643 *.

That this Cessation was considered by the Parliament of England, as so destructive to the Protestant Interest, that they immediately made a Declaration against it †.

* Enquiry, p. 1.

† Ibid.

That his Majesty, in Answer to this Declaration, published the Grounds and Motives of the Cessation; which in Effect were, that the English Army in Ireland could no longer subsist without Supplies—that the Parliament took no Care to send any—but on the contrary, the Earl of Warwick intercepted those which his Majesty sent—and that the Parliament endeavoured to draw the Scots Army out of Ireland into England; so that, in fine, there was an absolute Necessity of their Cessation, as preparatory to a Peace, which nevertheless he would never admit, unless it were such a Peace as might be agreeable to Conscience, Honour, and Justice.*

That notwithstanding this and other Reasons alledged by his Majesty, it appears that one of the principal Motives of the King's concluding the Cessation, was the View of drawing the Army, under the Marquis of Ormond's Command, from Ireland into England, for his own Support against the Parliament;

That in a Letter to the Marquis of Ormond, dated the 23d of April 1643, his Majesty expressly signifies as much—that as soon as this is done, (i. e. the Cessation is concluded) Ormond must bring over the Irish Army under his Command to Chester†.

That on the 7th of September following, his Majesty wrote a Letter to the Lords Justices and the Marquis of Ormond, wherein he ordered them to consider and advise of the best Means of transporting the rest of the Army in

* Enquiry, p. 2.

† Ibid. p. 3.

*the Province of Leinster (excepting such as are to be kept in Garrisons) into our Kingdom of England **.

That accordingly several Regiments were transported into England, some of which were killed or taken Prisoners by Sir Thomas Fairfax at Namptwich in Cheshire, and others were destroyed at the Siege at Gloucester †.

That this was a severe Disappointment to the King, who thereupon determined upon a Peace with the Irish Rebels, in order to employ not only the rest of the English Troops, still in Ireland, but also a considerable Body of the Irish themselves, whom he intended to send into England; that in Pursuance of this Resolution, he sent Orders to the Marquis of Ormond, then Lieutenant of Ireland, to negotiate the Peace ‡.

That in his Majesty's Letters to the Marquis of Ormond, it appears, that the Marquis had Orders to agree to the Suspension of Poining's Act, and that the penal Laws against the Roman Catholics should not be put in Execution, the Peace being made, and they remaining in their due Obedience ||.

That his Majesty further consented, that, when the Irish should give him the Assistance which they had promised, for the Suppression of the Rebellion, and he was restored to his Rights, he would consent to the Repeal of the Penal Laws.

That the King pressed a Peace upon the above Terms; but that the Marquis of Ormond was

* Enquiry, p. 3.

† Ibid. p. 4.

‡ Ibid. p. 5.

|| Ibid. p. 8.

so zealous a Protestant, that he was absolutely averse to the granting of the Terms, upon which the Irish Rebels insisted.*

That the King therefore having little Expectations, that his Lordship would consent to the Terms of the Irish Rebels, or that they would condescend to his, &c.——resolved upon a Method of satisfying the Irish without the Intervention of the Lord Lieutenant, and in so private a Manner, as to obviate the Prejudice, which his Concessions might raise against him amongst the Protestants in general †.

That accordingly, whilst the Marquis of Ormond was labouring with great Earnestness to make a Peace with the Rebels, by endeavouring to persuade them to desist from part of their Demands, the King resolved to employ secretly with them, Edward Somerset, Lord Herbert, Earl of Glamorgan, eldest Son of the Marquis of Worcester ‡.

That this Nobleman being a Roman Catholic, and connected with the confederate Catholics in Ireland by Affinity and Religion, was the most proper Person to negotiate a Peace with them; for that the King being in the Hands of the Protestants, could employ none but a Roman Catholic to grant the Irish their own Terms with regard to Religion, which were not fit to be known publicly, till his Majesty should (having subdued the Rebels in England and Scotland) be in a Condition to avow and ratify those Concessions ||.

* Enq. p. 6, 7, 8. † Ib. p. 14. ‡ Ib. p. 14, 15. || Ib. p. 16.

That *therefore the King, in a Letter dated December 27, 1644, recommends the Earl to the Marquis of Ormond, and employs him for the Purpose above mentioned* †.

That *his Majesty, on the 6th of January 1644-5, gave him a Commission for the same Purpose under the Great Seal, of which there is a Latin Translation in the Memoirs of John Baptista Rinuccini, the Pope's Nuncio, (Fol. 713) for levying any Number of Men in Ireland, and other Parts beyond Sea, commanding of them, putting Officers over them, Governors in Forts and Towns, and giving him Power to receive the King's Rents, &c.* §

That *on the 12th of that Month, his Majesty gave him another (VERY EXTRAORDINARY) Commission, under the Sign Manual and Private Signet at Oxford, (‡) and another full as extraordinary on the 12th of March following **: But what exceeds every Thing, the Enquirer tells us, that, *on the 1st of April 1644, a Patent was granted this Nobleman at Oxford, making him DUKE of SOMERSET, and giving him such Powers, as, I verily believe, are not to be met with in any other Patent upon Earth (§§).*

That *besides all this, his Majesty wrote a Letter to John Baptista Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, the Pope's Nuncio, who was then coming from Italy, in order to go to Ireland; and that this Letter was to be delivered by the*

† Enquiry p. 17.

§ Ib. p. 18.

‡ Ib. p. 20.

* Ib. p. 20, 21.

§§ Ib. p. 23, 24.

*Earl of Glamorgan to the Nuncio, that it might serve as a Credential for what the Earl had to treat with the Nuncio: That his Majesty wrote likewise a Letter to the Pope, addressed Beatissimo Patri Innocentio Decimo, i. e. To the most blessed Father, Innocent the Tenth. — That his Majesty delivered this Letter to the Earl of Glamorgan (†) and kept up a Correspondence with the Earl; there being, as the Enquirer tells us, two Letters, which his Majesty is said to have writ to him, one dated April 5, 1646, and another dated from Newcastle, July 20, 1646 *.*

These, besides the Transactions of some private unauthorized Persons, &c. are the chief Authorities and Evidences, upon which the Enquirer would endeavour to asperse the Memory of the Royal Martyr, and make his Readers believe, that he was by no means a Prince of that Virtue and Piety, which is generally ascribed to him. And indeed, if the Evidences which he hath produced can be depended upon, if they are such as he hath represented them, I think it is clear, that the World hath hitherto been greatly deceived with respect to the Character of that unfortunate Prince. — That he was so far from being a Prince of Virtue or Piety, that he was neither a good Man nor a good Protestant, — but an arrant Hypocrite, — deceiving and imposing upon all about him while he lived, and dying with a notorious Lie in his Mouth.

† *Enq.* p. 27.* *Ib.* p. 242, 243.

But if, on the other Hand, it shall appear that the chief Proofs, which the Enquirer has offered for this Purpose, *are no Proofs at all*; that some of them are *nothing to his Purpose*, and others *arrant Forgeries*; that, in many Instances, he has manifestly endeavoured to *misrepresent* Matters, and *impose upon* the World; if this shall appear, then, I presume, the judicious Reader will agree with me, that the Author of such Calumnies upon a murdered Sovereign must have more to answer for, than the Pleasure of publishing an ingenious Libel, or the Vanity of haranguing in a Coffee-House, can possibly compensate.

First, then, we are told, *that in the Year 1643, a Cessation was made with the Irish Rebels by the King's Order.—That the Parliament was greatly displeased at it, and considered it as very prejudicial to the Protestant Interest, i. e. to the Parliamentary Rebels.—That one principal Motive for concluding it, was, that the King might bring over the Irish Army under the Command of the Marquis of Ormond, (i. e. an Army which had fought bravely against the Irish Rebels) for his own Support against the Parliament:—*

That accordingly several Regiments were brought into England, and destroyed or taken Prisoners by the English Parliamentary Troops:

That the King thereupon resolved upon a Peace with the Rebels in Ireland, and offered them such Terms, as in other Circumstances he had

bad declared he would not grant them upon any Pretence whatsoever.

Now, supposing all this to be true, what is it to the Enquirer's Purpose? Does it follow from hence, that he gave a Commission to the Earl of *Glamorgan* to do the extravagant Things which he did in the Years 1645 and 1646?

The Protestants in *Ireland* in 1643, (as hath been shewn already *) were reduced to the utmost Extremities, and must have been entirely ruined and destroyed, had not his Majesty consented to a Cessation with the *Irish* Rebels; but does it follow from hence, that he authorized the *Earl of Glamorgan* to grant the Rebels Terms, which might have endangered the Safety of the Protestant Religion? If the King consented to a Cessation with the *Irish* Rebels for the Preservation of his Protestant Subjects, is this a Reason, that he would do a Thing, which was utterly *inconsistent with their Preservation*? that he would empower *Glamorgan* to grant the Rebels Terms and Privileges, which in all Probability would have entirely ruined the Protestants, and extirpated them in that Part of his Dominions?

The *Enquirer* foresaw these Difficulties, and therefore found it necessary to have Recourse to Artifices of a very extraordinary Nature. He foresaw, that the sensible Part of Mankind would not easily be persuaded, that a Prince, whom Writers of all

* Case of the Royal Martyr, Vol. I. p. 234,—238, &c.
Denq.

Denominations have represented as a *wise, virtuous, and zealous Protestant*, could be capable of acting such a wicked, hypocritical, absurd Part——could be capable of granting Commissions so ridiculous —— so inconsistent with the Principles which he had steadily adhered to all his Life-time, and publicly and solemnly avowed at his Death. In order therefore to reconcile his Readers to his new and wonderful Discoveries, he advances a Step farther. He takes great Pains to make his Readers believe, that King *Charles* was not a sincere Member of the Church of *England*, but a Favourer of the Papists; tho' I am inclined to think, that he does not believe one Syllable of this Charge himself, since he hath, from the Beginning to the End of his *Enquiry*, carefully avoided to declare his Belief of what he labours so earnestly to instil into his Readers. But unless this Charge could be fixed upon the King, he knew he could have little Hopes, that any great Regard would be paid to his Performance. He therefore takes the most artful Pains to insinuate,

That the King was no good Protestant—— no sincere Member of the Church of England;

That he had Recourse to Measures for re-establishing the Peace of his Kingdoms, which might have endangered the Safety of the Protestant Religion, and which a good Protestant would have abhorred;

That he had resolved upon granting the Irish Rebels a Cessation, before there was that Necessity

cessity for it which his Majesty pretended; at least before the Scots had designed to send an Army into England;

That one of his principal Motives for concluding a Cessation, was the View of transporting some of his Irish Troops into England, for his Support against the Parliament; and

*That being disappointed in this Affair, he resolved upon a Peace with the Irish Rebels, and consented to grant them such Terms, as no sincere Member of the Church of England——none but a Favourer of the Papists, would have consented to.——*Base Insinuations! But this is not all. For fear his Readers should find it difficult to swallow such shocking Imputations, he endeavours to fix them upon his Majesty by an Artifice, which was surely never before made use of by a Writer of the least Pretensions to Credit or Character. He insinuates, that the *Duke of Ormond* himself suspected his Majesty's Principles in Point of Religion*. And tho' he must know the Insinuation to be absolutely false (as will be shewn immediately) yet his Misrepresentation of this Particular is made the Foundation of all his subsequent Calumnies upon the King —— of all the idle and absurd *Commissions* which he would fain make the World believe his Majesty granted to the *Earl of Glamorgan*.

“ The Marquis of *Ormond*, says he, was so
“ zealous a Protestant, that he was absolutely a-
“ verse to the granting of the Terms, upon which

* *Enquiry*, p. 13, 14.

“ the *Irish Rebels* insisted. The King there-
 “ fore having little Expectations, that the Mar-
 “ quis would consent to the Terms of the
 “ *Irish Rebels*, or that *they* would condescend
 “ to *his*, employed the *Earl of Glamorgan* se-
 “ cretly to grant them their own Terms with
 “ regard to Religion, and gave him Commis-
 “ sions, Letters, &c. for that Purpose *.”

This is the Method, by which the impartial *Enquirer* hath endeavoured to fix upon King *Charles I.* the above infamous Charges; which therefore I shall proceed to examine distinctly.

i: Then, it is insinuated, *That his Majesty was no good Protestant — no sincere Member of the Church of England.*

The Suggestions and pretended Facts brought to support this Insinuation, shall be considered immediately. At present I shall only add a Word or two to what has been said already.

In the foregoing Pages it has been shewn, that Writers of very different Interests and Denominations, who knew his Majesty personally, concur in assuring us, that he was a zealous Protestant. And it is remarkable, that *Rinuccini*, the Pope's Nuncio, the Author of those very *Memoirs* to which the *Enquirer* pays such an implicit Regard, whenever they mention any thing in Prejudice to his Majesty's Character, was of the very same Opinion. This Writer observes, “ That his Majesty was not to be
 “ wrought on, by any Consideration, to favour

* *Enquiry*, p. 12, 13, &c.

“ Popery.

“ Popery.” When he was desired by the *Pope* to write his Sentiments on the Subject of the Articles proposed by the *English Roman Catholics** (which made the Substance of what the Nuncio calls Sir *Kenelm Digby’s* Treaty and the Pope’s Peace) he, who was obliged on such an Occasion, to write nothing but undisguised Truth to his Master, says in his Letter of the 21st of July 1645 †, to *Cardinal Pamfilio*, “ That tho’ the King might speak justly of
 “ some of them, whose Fidelity he had tried,
 “ yet he could *never discover any the least Sign*
 “ *of his Inclination to the Roman Catholics.*
 “ And of this, adds he, I am very well assured, by all the wise and judicious Men that
 “ I have compared Sentiments with at *Paris.*”
 It was for this Reason, that he declared his firm Opinion, “ That the King never would consent
 “ to those Articles ‡, and that nothing could
 “ be expected from him, but by mere Force,
 “ and when necessitated by the Want of Troops
 “ to make head against the Parliamentarians.”
 The Nuncio, in all his Conduct and Management of Affairs in *Ireland*, considered King *Charles* as an *obstinate Protestant*; zealous for his false Religion, and treated him as an irreclaimable Heretic. He never deviated from this Kind of Treatment, except in one Instance, when, in his Zeal for opposing the Peace of 1646, he declared in his Speech to the supreme Council of *Kilkenny* ||, That the Pope’s In-

* *Enquiry*, p. 44, 45. † *Memoirs*, f. 859. ‡ *Ibid.* 850, 858, 860, 1020. ¶ *Ibid.* f. 1384.

structions were to be reduced to two Heads, *viz.* the preserving of their Fidelity, first to God and Religion, and *next to their King*; and for this he was reprimanded by *Pamfilio*, because, though the Pope might possibly have said these Words to him, he should not have mentioned them in the Council, since the See of *Rome* never would by any positive Act approve the civil Allegiance, which Roman Catholic Subjects pay to an heretical Prince. And hence arose the Difficulties, which had occurred since the Time of *Henry VIII.* about the Oath of Allegiance, which the Kings of *England* exacted from the Roman Catholics.

It was King *Charles's* known Affection for the Doctrines and Constitution of the Church of *England*, which created all the Difficulties in the *Treaty of Peace* with the *Irish*, and made them despair of any Favour from him, but what was extorted by Violence and Necessity. This is so evident from the whole Tenor of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, that the Enquirer's Insinuations to the contrary, I may venture to say, are no great Sign of his Modesty or Integrity, however they may answer some other Purposes.

Whatever the King yielded to, either in *that Treaty*, or in the *Cessation*, was purely the Result of Necessity, and for the Preservation of his Protestant Subjects, who must else have been utterly ruined *.

This, with Respect to the *Cessation*, is proved

* See *Clarend.* Vol. II. p. 415, 16, 17, 18, 19, &c.

to a Demonstration in the Life of the Duke of *Ormond* §. By the Memorial of Sir *Philip Percival*, great Grand-father of the present Earl of *Egmont*, this whole Affair was cleared up even to the Conviction of the Parliamentarian Rebels in the *English* House of Commons, *A. D.* 1645, *i. e.* about two Years after the Cessation was made, when the State of Affairs, and the Circumstances of Facts, were much better known than they can be at this Time.

The Evidence then for the King's Protestant Principles, I presume, is full and satisfactory. The very Author, from whom the Enquirer hath borrowed so many idle Tales and Aspersions upon his Majesty, is express to the Purpose. So that, with Respect to this Particular, the Testimonies of *Churchmen*, *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Papists*, are unanimous. They all admit, that the King was a zealous Protestant; and where a Truth is confirmed and supported by the united Testimonies of such a Cloud of unexceptionable Witnesses, Witnesses of such different Sentiments, Parties, and Interests, nothing surely but the most incontestable Facts can be deemed sufficient to confront or impeach them †.

However, Facts, it must be allowed, are an

§ Vol. I. p. 418, 419, 424, &c. and from p. 454 to p. 463.

† Add to this a Book intitled, *Certamen Religiosum*, or a Conference betwixt the late King *Charles* and the Lord Marquis of *Worcester* concerning Religion, by *Christopher Cartwright*, B. D. 4to. printed for *Richard Roysson*; and I think the Evidence for his Majesty's Protestant Prin-

Evi-

Evidence of a very EXTRAORDINARY Nature; and provided they are fairly represented, and full Proofs of the Point in Question, they must necessarily supersede and determine us with Regard to any Difficulties which may arise from the Evidence of Testimony. Give me leave therefore,

2. To examine the Facts, which are alledged in support of the above Insinuation. Here then we are told,

*That the King had Recourse to Measures for re-establishing the Peace of his Kingdoms, which might have endangered the Safety of the Protestant Religion, and which a good Protestant would have abhorred *.*

That he had resolved upon granting the Irish Rebels a Cessation before there was that Necessity for it, which his Majesty pretended; at least before the Scots had designed to send an Army into England.

That one of his principal Motives for concluding a Cessation, was the View of transporting some of his Irish Troops into England for his Support against the Parliament.

That being disappointed in this Affair, he resolved upon a Peace with the Irish Rebels, and consented to grant them such Terms, as no sincere Member of the Church of England, none

ciples is out of the Reach of Exception; it being the express Design of the King in that Conference, to convince the Marquis of the Errors of the Church of Rome, and to reconcile him to the Reformed Religion.

* See the Preface to the Enquiry. See p. 2, 3, 4, 5, &c.
C 2 - but

but a Favourer of the Papists, would have consented to; and that he did all this, after he had made the most solemn Promises to the contrary.

But how does all this appear? Did the King consent to a *Peace* with the *Irish*, or even a *Cessation* of Arms, till his Necessities required it? till his Protestant Subjects were reduced to the utmost Extremities, and must otherwise have been utterly ruined? Did the King consent to a Cessation, *till the English Army could no longer subsist without Supplies?* — *Till the Parliament took no Care to send any, and till the Troops which his Majesty sent, were intercepted by the Earl of Warwick?* No; it is most certain, that he did not. He never could be induced to grant the Rebels any Terms, *till the Parliament endeavoured to draw the Scots Army out of Ireland,—and till he was apprized that the Scots were preparing an Army to invade England.* And were not these sufficient Reasons for his Majesty to consult all proper Measures for preserving his Protestant Subjects?

Who were most likely to endanger the Safety of the *Protestant Religion*, his Majesty, who sent Forces for the Preservation of his *Protestant Subjects*, or they who intercepted them? Who most likely to ruin the Protestant Interest in *Ireland*, they who endeavoured to draw the *Scots Army* out of that Kingdom, and leave the Protestants exposed to the Cruelty of the *Irish Rebels*, or his Majesty, who, by a Cessation, endeavoured to put a Stop to it? And yet the *Enquirer* is not ashamed to insinuate, that
the

the King by consenting to a Cessation, &c. with the *Irish* Rebels, might have endangered the Safety of the Protestant Religion. Base Misrepresentation!

I cannot help making a Remark in this Place, which may not be unworthy the Reader's Notice. It is observable, that the *English* Rebels, in many Instances, first disabled his Majesty from doing what was necessary, and then blamed him for *not doing* what they themselves endeavoured by every undutiful Artifice to prevent. The King had desired and pressed the Parliament to send some Forces into *Ireland*, in order to put a Stop to the Progress of the *Irish* Rebels, and they took no Care of the Affair. The King then, sensible of the Distress of the Protestants in that Kingdom, resolved himself to send some Forces to their Relief, which the *Earl of Warwick* intercepted. And when, in Consequence of this, his Majesty was forced to grant the Rebels a Cessation, in order to preserve the Remainder of his *loyal Subjects*, he was blamed for not carrying on the War with the *Rebels*, and charged with endangering the Safety of the Protestant Religion. Nothing surely can reach the Malevolence, the Bigotry, and Virulence of Writers, who are capable of being Advocates for Measures so apparently indefensible.

But the Enquirer will have it, *that the King had resolved upon a Cessation before the Scots had designed to send an Army into England.*

And what are his Reasons for it? Why, he

tells us, " That his Majesty resolved to make
 " the Cessation, before the Parliament's Nego-
 " tiation with *Scotland*, their Commissioners
 " not setting out for that Kingdom till the
 " 21st of *July*, and long before the *Scots* Re-
 " solution to levy an Army. For his Majesty
 " sent the Marquis of *Ormond* a Commission
 " to treat with the Rebels for a Cessation on
 " the 23d of *April* 1643, and repeated his
 " Orders on the 3d of *May*, and 2d of *July*;
 " and it was not till the 7th of *September*,
 " that he mentioned, as a Reason for giving
 " such Orders, that an Army was preparing in
 " *Scotland* to invade *England*; which Reason
 " he would in all Probability have produced
 " before, if it had been one of the Motives of
 " his Orders." (*Eng. p. 317.*)

So that here are two Reasons assigned in
 Support of the above Calumny.

1. That, *if his Majesty had been apprized of
 the Design of the Scots to send an Army into
 England, he would probably have mentioned it,
 when he published the Grounds and Motives of a
 Cessation.* And

2. That *the Scots had not resolved upon
 sending an Army into England, till the Parli-
 ament's Negotiation with Scotland, which was
 subsequent to the King's Orders for a Cessation.*

But if his Majesty was apprized of the De-
 sign of the *Scots*, what Reason can be given
 that he would have mentioned it, when he
 published his Motives for the Cessation? I think
 it is highly probable, and I am persuaded, the
 judicious

judicious Reader will agree with me, that, upon the Enquirer's own State of the Case, common Prudence would have directed his Majesty to have concealed the Affair at that Time, *though he was apprized of it*. Would any prudent Prince, at such a Conjunction, have charged a Nation with a factious and rebellious Design, before he was well assured, that they had resolved to put it in Execution? Would not such a public Declaration from the Throne have been apt to exasperate the *Scots*, and make them more his Enemies, than they were before? Now that the *Scots* had not come to a *formal Resolution* to bring an Army into *England*, when his Majesty published his Motives for a Cessation, let the Words of the *Enquirer* suffice to shew. His Majesty resolved to make a Cessation long before the Parliament's Negotiation with *Scotland*, and (consequently) *long before the Resolution of the Scots to levy an Army*. So that, upon the Enquirer's own State of the Case, this Argument is nothing to his Purpose; it being highly probable, that the Reason which the Enquirer has given, *why his Majesty would have mentioned the Design of the Scots*, when he published his Motives for a Cessation, *was the very Reason why he did not mention it*; viz. *not because he was not apprized of it*, but because he could not be sure that the *Scots* had resolved to carry their Design into Execution. I only mention this Circumstance to let the Reader see, to what a low, absurd Conjecture, the Enquirer has been obliged to

have Recourse, in order to support a Calumny, which in all Probability he knew was fully refuted many Years ago.

It is most certain, that the King was apprized of the Design of the *Scots*, long before he published his Motives for a *Cessation*. And as it is no less certain, that the Calumny upon his Majesty in this respect, was fully refuted almost as soon as his Enemies endeavoured to fix it upon him, so it is not unlikely that the *Enquirer* must have seen what has been said upon the Occasion.

The public Treaty of the *English* Parliament with the *Scots*, it is granted, was subsequent to the King's Orders for a *Cessation*. The *Enquirer* therefore might safely say, that the *Scots* did not resolve (*i. e.* did not *formally resolve*) to send an Army into *England*, till the Parliament's *public Negotiation* with *Scotland*. But does it follow from hence, that the Design was not in Agitation long before that Period, or that his Majesty was not apprized of it? Does not every one know by continual Experience, that Matters are frequently carried on by private Negotiations, and generally settled before a Treaty is set on Foot?

As to the Case in Question, it is clearly proved in a Book, which the *Enquirer* is well acquainted with (the D. of *Ormond's* Life, Vol. I. p. 444.) that the *Scots* had, some Months before any of the King's Orders for a *Cessation*, resolved to send an Army to the Assistance of the Parliamentary Rebels in *England*, and that the Marquis

quis of *Montrose* had, upon the Queen's landing in *England*, *February* 164 $\frac{2}{3}$, acquainted her with that Resolution. The Enquirer however hath not thought fit to take Notice of these Proofs, but hath absolutely and without Restriction affirmed, *that the King had resolved to make the Cessation before the Parliament's Negotiation with Scotland*. And if he means their public Negotiation, it is readily admitted. But upon the whole, what is all this, but ingeniously prevaricating and imposing upon his Readers?

Does it become an impartial Enquirer after Truth, thus to persist in reviving Calumnies upon a murdered Sovereign, which have been refuted over and over again? Does it become a Critic, or a Scholar, to take no Notice of what has been offered in his Majesty's Defence? or can it be any Credit to such a Writer to publish his own absurd, conjectural Notions, for Facts, and oppose them to the most incontestable Evidence?

What an amiable or despicable Creature is a Scholar of fine and uncommon Parts! As long as Truth is his sole Aim, what *great Service* may redound to the Public, to Religion and Liberty, from his Labours! What *great Mischief*, if his Views should be *mean, mercenary* or *ambitious*! *Vanity* or *Interest* can surely have no Votary amongst Critics and Scholars, where Truth, lovely Truth, makes her Appearance, and demands their Regard.

The

The *Enquirer's* next Infination is so weak and invidious, has so much of political Birdlime in it, and at the same time so much of the State-bugbear to frighten Women and Children, that I shall have no Occasion to tire the Reader with a long Examination of it.

The *Enquirer* has suggested, that one of his Majesty's principal Motives for concluding a Cessation with the Rebels, was the View of transporting some of his *Irish Troops* into *England* for his Support against the Parliament.

And supposing the Charge to be strictly true, how does it affect his Majesty's Character? Is there the least Reason to blame him for employing his own Forces, as well against *English* and *Scots* Rebels, as against *Irish*, when the Necessity of his Affairs, or the Safety of his Person and loyal Subjects required it?

But neither is the Charge strictly true; it having been clearly proved, that the chief Motive for the King's concluding a Cessation, was the distressed State of the Protestants in *Ireland*. And after a Cessation was made, after his Majesty had in some Measure provided for the Safety of his Protestant Subjects in that Kingdom, was he not strictly justified, in endeavouring, by the united Strength of his Forces, to re-establish the Peace and provide for the Safety of his other Dominions? Did he enter upon this Measure in a hasty, violent or precipitate manner? Did he not act with the utmost Caution, and consult those zealous Protestants *, the

* See *Enquiry*; p. 12.

Lord Lieutenant and the Council of *Ireland*, in every Step that he took in this Respect? Did he so much as think of bringing over any of his Troops into *England*, till a *Cessation* should be made; till he should get a Respite for his Protestant Subjects, and put them in a peaceable Situation? No; it is certain that he did not; as is clear from the very Letter, which the *Enquirer* has given us, in order to prove, that his Majesty's Conduct in this Respect was highly culpable.

Ormond,

" I have sent you herewith a Command and
 " Power to make a *Cessation* with the Rebels;
 " which tho' it be not so formally legal as I
 " could wish, yet I desire you earnestly to put
 " those my Commands in Execution; and as
 " soon as that is done (not before) *Ormond*
 " must bring over the *Irish* Army under his
 " Command to *Chester*, &c.

Oxford, April 23,
 1643.

CHALRES REX.

Lord *Clarendon's* Testimony is still more full to the Purpose. " The King, says he, finding by Degrees, that it was not in his Power
 " to compose the Disturbances of *England*, or
 " to prevent those of *Scotland*, and abhorring
 " the Thought of introducing a foreign Nation to subdue his own Subjects, he began to
 " think

“ think of Expedients, which might allay the
 “ Distempers of *Ireland*; that so having one
 “ of his Kingdoms in Peace, he might apply
 “ the Power of *that* towards the procuring it
 “ in his other Dominions. He was not igno-
 “ rant, how tender an Argument that Busi-
 “ ness of *Ireland* was, and how prepared Men
 “ were to pervert whatsoever he said or did in
 “ it; and therefore he resolved to proceed with
 “ that Caution, that whatsoever was done in it,
 “ should be done by the Council of that State,
 “ who were understood to be most skilful in
 “ those Affairs * ”. To multiply Testimonies
 of this Sort would be tedious, as well as need-
 less. I have chose in the present Case to quote
 such Passages, as are quoted for a very different
 Purpose by the *Enquirer* himself.

It is amazing, that a Writer should be capa-
 ble of blaming the King for doing a Thing so
 much like what the very Parliament themselves
 had done before, and which their own rebel-
 lious Behaviour had forced him upon. Did not
 the Parliament endeavour to draw the *Scots*
 Army out of *Ireland*, and engage them in their
 Service against the King? and was not this one
 Reason expressly assigned by his Majesty for
 having Recourse to the same Expedient, for
 bringing some of his Forces into *England*?
 And yet the *Enquirer* has not scrupled to infi-
 nue, that his Majesty was culpable for intend-
 ing to do, what the Parliament had before,
 what they had forced him upon, what the

* Book vii. p. 372.

Safety of himself and his People required, and what he had a Right to do by the Laws of Religion and Nature, of God and Man. The Parliament, it seems, in express Contradiction to that Allegiance which they owed their Sovereign, could without any great Imputation endeavour to engage his own Forces in a Rebellion against him; but the King had no Right to employ them against those very Rebels who had traiterously attempted to debauch the Allegiance of his Subjects, and throw his Dominions into a State of the utmost Confusion and Misery. Never surely did such Insinuations, such Reasoning drop from the Pen of a Critic or a Scholar before.

One would wonder at first Sight, why this Charge upon his Majesty is so often mentioned by Writers. I shall therefore offer a Word or two, in order to apprise the Reader of the Design of this Piece of political Artifice.

During the Great Rebellion, amongst numerous other Stratagems, when any *Irish Forces* were designed for the Assistance of his Majesty, the Nation was generally alarmed, and the Forces, whether Protestants or Papists, were represented as a Set of *Irish Rebels* and *Cut-throats*. The City of *London* was once put into the utmost Consternation by such an Alarm. The People were made to believe, that there was to be an Insurrection in the Night-time; that they were to be murdered in their Beds, and that the horrid Scene of an *Irish Massacre* was to be acted over again in *England*. Stories of this

this Kind, during the Troubles of King *Charles*, were frequently propagated with great Affiduity; and since that Time, there have not been wanting Writers, who would insinuate, that the Design of his Majesty in sending for Troops out of *Ireland*, was to employ them for the same bloody and barbarous Purpose.

The *Enquirer* indeed has been pretty modest in this Respect. He tells us very honestly, that the Troops which his Majesty ordered to be transported into *England*, were the Troops under the Command of that zealous Protestant the *Duke of Ormond*. But then he knew, that the Words *Irish*, *Irish Army*, &c. were terrible Words, Words which would have a proper Weight with some People. That therefore they might not escape the Notice of his Readers, he takes particular Care to print them in *Capitals* or *Italics*, almost throughout his whole Performance.

However, in drawing up what he calls a *faithful Deduction of Authorities and Evidences*, he had Occasion to mention the Troops, which were ordered to be sent into *England* for his Majesty's Service in 1643, and which were landed in *Cheshire*. These Troops, the *Enquirer* knew, were mostly *English Protestants*. He was therefore obliged in effect to own as much, they having more than once been engaged in the King's Service, and behaved bravely against the *Irish Rebels*. But this Behaviour must not be admitted as a Proof of their Attachment to his Majesty. To admit,
that

that such Troops were sincerely in the Interest of the King, was paying him too high a Compliment. What then was to be done? Why, it must be suggested, that they were Transports forced into *England*, and engaged in his Majesty's Service against their Will. *They were generally*, says the Enquirer, *very unwilling to go to fight against their own Countrymen*. And supposing it to be true; supposing these Troops were unwilling to go to fight against their Countrymen, what follows? What does it prove upon the Whole? Why, it proves clearly, that they had been tampered with: That great Pains in all Probability had been taken to persuade them to throw off their Allegiance, to abandon the King, and join the *English* Rebels: That great Pains had been taken, to make them believe, that his Majesty was a Favourer of the Papists; and that the Rebels, the open and avowed Enemies of the true, primitive, reformed Religion in *England*, were the only true Protestants in the Kingdom. Whenever the Enquirer shall assign a better Reason for the Behaviour of those Troops, I will readily grant him every Consequence which shall redound to the Advantage of his Cause.

A Word or two more, and I shall have done with this Particular. Writers, who will have it, that King *Charles* was generally in the Wrong, and seldom did any Thing which was right, usually blunder on, till they involve themselves in the greatest Absurdities. The
Enquirer

Enquirer tells us, that the *Troops to be transported from Ireland, were very unwilling to go to fight against their own Countrymen.* This we are told, I suppose, with a Design to let us know, that they were brave, honest, humane, conscientious Protestants,—that they thought it unnatural and unchristian to fight against their Countrymen. If this was the Enquirer's Design, I agree with him, that a tender and disinterested Regard for the general Good, the general Happiness, the Lives and Liberties of our Countrymen and Fellow Protestants, is an Indication of a most amiable and humane Disposition.

But supposing our Countrymen and Fellow Protestants should be Rebels, or Traitors, or Highwaymen, or Murderers, is it any great Breach of Humanity to chastise and punish the Insolence of Men, whose Actions have a Tendency to interrupt the Happiness of every individual Person in the Kingdom?

If it was so very *commendable* in the Troops from *Ireland* to be *unwilling to fight against their Countrymen*, how came their Countrymen to act a Part so very different by them? How came they to fall upon them in such an unmerciful Manner, as soon almost as they set Foot on *English* Ground? If the Troops from *Ireland* were to be commended for being unwilling to fight against their Countrymen, how come their Countrymen to be so very unwilling and eager to attack and destroy such Numbers, not only of *them*, but of *others*, their Countrymen

trymen and Fellow Protestants, in almost every Part of these his Majesty's Dominions?

To say, that those *Countrymen* of ours fought in their own Defence, and in Defence of their Liberties is very little to the Purpose. Should we admit the Plea, which by the by has no Foundation to support it, (as hath been shewn already *) it is certain, that the Troops from *Ireland*, and all the King's Forces, had at least the same Plea for fighting against *them*. The King's Forces had an Authority, to which their Countrymen could have no Pretensions. They had a regular Commission from his Majesty, for what they did. The King's Commission not only authorized, but obliged the Troops from *Ireland* to land and appear in Arms in any Part of his Dominions, wherever they were ordered, and no Person, unless *properly commissioned*, could attack, molest, or destroy them without incurring the Guilt of Murder or Rebellion.

The worst of Actions may be glossed over, and represented in a plausible Light; but a private, uncommissioned *Englishman*, who wilfully and violently kills his Fellow Subject, is by the Laws of God and his Country—a Murderer. Few People are so hardy, as to justify the Murder of King *Charles*. And one Reason assigned for the horrid and unjustifiable Nature of it, is that the Regicides had no more Authority for perpetuating the detestable Fact, than a Highwayman has for murdering his Fellow Creature. And indeed, from whom

* See Vol. I. p. 147.

could they possibly derive their Commission to try, to condemn, to execute their Sovereign Prince, who alone could give them a Power to perform the least judicial Act throughout his Dominions?

But if, for Want of a Commission, the Regicides can never be justified in murdering the King, may not the same Incapacity, the same unauthorized Character affect those, who were concerned in shedding the Blood of such a Number of their Fellow Christians? I sincerely hope, it will never be required at their Hands; I hope, that the Blood of a murdered Sovereign, and so many loyal Subjects and true Protestants, will never be laid to their Charge.

The Insinuations in the Enquiry are sometimes so idle and absurd, that nothing surely, which bears the Name of a Critic or a Scholar, will own itself to be the Author of it. *Unauthorized Protestants*, it seems, upon the most groundless Pretences, might rebel, and do what they pleased; they were only to pretend, that the King was a Favourer of the Papists, and they might molest, harass, and murder his Loyal Adherents, even their Countrymen and Fellow Protestants, without doing any great Harm.

Whereas *Protestants*, who had a regular Commission from their Prince, to chastise the Insolence of factious and rebellious Men; *should*, it seems, *have been careful, how they executed that Commission in Prejudice to their Countrymen and Fellow Protestants*; they should have
been

been tender of their Lives, they should have been *cautious, how they fought against them*, though they openly appeared in Arms harrasing their Country, and making the most dreadful Havock amongst their Fellow Subjects.

The Troops from Ireland, says the Enquirer, *were very unwilling to fight against their Countrymen*; by which, if he designs any Thing, he must design to insinuate, that they were to be commended for it; that their unwillingness to fight against their Countrymen, shewed them to be good, conscientious, humane Men; *i. e.* in plain English, to be unwilling to fight against the open and avowed Enemies of the Constitution in Church and State, is to be good, conscientious, and humane. I am quite tired with examining such apparent Absurdities, and heartily ask the Reader's Pardon for a tedious Digression.

The next Charge upon his Majesty is more material. But as it hath been partly considered already, I shall be very short in my Reply to it. It is suggested by the Enquirer, *that the Defeat of the Troops transported from Ireland, was a severe Disappointment to the King; that therefore he resolved upon a Peace with the Irish Rebels, and consented to grant them such Terms, as no sincere Member of the Church of England, none but a Favourer of the Papists would have consented to, and that he did this, after he had made the most solemn Promises to the contrary.*

But supposing (as was said before) a Person had promised his Friend in the most solemn

Manner, to stay with him three or four Days at his House, would he be obliged to be as good as his Word, if his House in the mean Time chanced to be set on Fire? The King sometime in the Beginning of the Year, 1642, assured his Protestant Subjects, that he had no Intentions of tolerating Popery, and that he would never consent to such a Thing, upon any Pretence whatsoever. But when his Majesty made this Promise, had not these Protestant Subjects of his promised and sworn, that they would bear true and faithful Allegiance to him? Most certainly they had; and yet before the King had offered any Terms to the *Irish*, before he wrote to the Marquis of *Ormond*, these good Protestant Subjects had invited the *Scots* into *England*, and appeared in open Rebellion against him.

Princes, as well as private Men, are forced to alter their Measures and Resolutions according to the different Situation of their Affairs; and they often do so, without any Imputation of Levity or Inconstancy. But the Enquirer thinks it too much to allow King *Charles* the like Liberty. He must be tied down to his first Sentiments and Measures, without the least Deviation from either, though to save his Life, and prevent the Ruin of himself and his People.

The Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs* says *, that from the Beginning of that King's Reign, the Roman Catholics of *Ireland* exer-

* p. 342.

cised their Religion only in their Houses; and the Enquirer tells us, that the *King* had declared, *he would never grant them a Toleration*. But could he adhere to this Resolution, when the greatest Part of the Kingdom was in their Hands, and he was neither able to recover it, nor even to save the rest, even to prevent the Remains of his Protestant Subjects from falling into their Power, without agreeing to a Peace, and making some Concessions? And yet in all the King's Orders and Instructions to the Duke of *Ormond* on this Subject, he constantly restrained him * from consenting to any Terms, which either derogated from his Honour or Royal Dignity, or clashed with the Preservation of his Protestant Subjects. Nor did he in the greatest Distress, and in the utter Ruin of his Affairs in *England* ever retract these Restrictions, and it is equally false and base in any one to insinuate the Contrary.

The utmost Enlargement of Powers, which the *King*, when reduced to Extremity, gave the *Lord Lieutenant*, consisted in allowing him to consent to a *Suspension* of *Poyning's Act* for a Time, and to a like temporary Repeal of the *Penal Laws* against the *Roman Catholics* †. That Act had been made in the Reign of *Henry VII.* by a Parliament, composed only of Lords, and the Representatives of the four Counties lying about *Dublin*. And however necessary it might be in the Times, when it passed, yet

* Life of the Duke of *Ormond*, Vol. III. p. 387. 418.
422. † *Ib.* p. 418.

after the Reduction and Plantation of *Ulster*, the Reason of it ceased in a great Measure, and it came to be considered by most People, who had any Interest in *Ireland*, as an Intrenchment on the Freedom, and an Obstruction to the Good of the Kingdom.

But this was a Matter of a civil Nature; the other was the only Point, which concerned Religion; and was to be granted only in case of an effectual Assistance from the *Irish*, sufficient to merit such an Indulgence. And what is there more in this (abating the Formality of a temporary Repeal) than the *Roman* Catholics enjoyed not long ago? I am credibly informed, that in the *Naas* and other Towns they have been seen on Holydays coming out of their Mass-houses in such Numbers, as were surprising; a Liberty, which they never had in King *Charles's* Time, and which he would never grant (till Necessity obliged him) in the Extent, in which it was lately enjoyed. Nor is it easy to find any material Difference between the Repeal and the Non-execution of Laws; unless it be, that the Formality of keeping them in Force affords a Pretence for the *Irish* to make loud Clamours in foreign Courts about their being persecuted for Religion, which *other Sectaries* have maintained to be contrary to the natural Rights of Mankind.

Whatever the King yielded to (as was said before) in the Duke of *Ormond's* Treaty with the *Irish*, was purely the Result of Necessity, and for the Preservation of his Protestant Subjects.

jects. This appears from every Proof, which the Nature of the Thing will admit of. At present I choose only to appeal to a Letter writ by the King to the Duke of *Ormond* upon the Subject. This Letter the *Enquirer* has given us, as a Proof to shew, that his Majesty was impatient and desirous of a Peace with the *Irish* Rebels, and consequently a Proof, which can be liable to no Exception. And as it contains the Substance of the Charge, which is here alledged against the King, I shall give it the Reader at large.

Ormond,

“ The Impossibility of preserving my Protestant Subjects in *Ireland* by a Continuation
 “ of the War having moved me to give you
 “ those Powers, and Directions, which I have
 “ formerly done, for the concluding of a Peace
 “ there; and the same growing daily much
 “ more evident, that alone were Reason enough
 “ for me to enlarge your Powers and make my
 “ Commands in the Point more positive. But
 “ besides these Considerations, it being now
 “ manifest, that the *English* Rebels have (as
 “ far as in them lies) given the Command of
 “ *Ireland* to the *Scots*; that their Aim is a
 “ total Subversion of Religion and regal Power;
 “ and that nothing less will content them, or
 “ purchase Peace here; I think myself bound
 “ in Conscience not to let slip the Means of
 “ settling that Kingdom (if it may be) fully
 “ under my Obedience, nor to lose that As-

“ sistance, which I may hope from my *Irish*
 “ Subjects for such Scruples, as in a less pres-
 “ sing Condition might reasonably be stuck at
 “ by me for their Satisfaction. I do therefore
 “ command you to conclude a Peace with the
 “ *Irish*, whatever it cost, so that my *Protestant*
 “ *Subjects there may be secured and my regal*
 “ *Authority preserved.* But for all this you
 “ are to make me the best Bargain you can,
 “ and not to discover your Enlargement of
 “ Power, till you needs must. And tho’ I leave
 “ the Managing of this great and necessary Work
 “ intirely to you, yet I cannot but tell you,
 “ that if the Suspension of *Poining’s Act* for
 “ such Bills, as shall be agreed on between you
 “ there, and the *present taking away* of the pe-
 “ nal Laws against Papists by a Law will do it,
 “ I shall not think it a hard Bargain, so that
 “ freely and vigorously they engage themselves
 “ in my Assistance against my Rebels of *Eng-*
 “ *land and Scotland*, for which no Conditions
 “ can be too hard, not being against Conscience
 “ or Honour. So I rest your assured, constant
 “ Friend,

Oxford, 27 Feb.
 1644.

CHARLES R.

From this Letter it appears,

That his Majesty’s Protestant Subjects in *Ire-*
land were reduced to the utmost Extremities ;

That the Rebels in *England* were so far from
 contributing to their Relief, that they obsti-
 nately persisted in their Rebellion, and had gi-
 ven the Command of *Ireland* to the *Scots* ;

That

That their Aim was a total Subversion of Religion and regal Power ;

That nothing less would content them or purchase a Peace in *England* ;

That consequently his Majesty was not so very desirous (as the *Enquirer* would insinuate) of concluding a Peace with the *Irish*, till his Necessities required it ; till the undutiful Behaviour of the Parliamentarians had forced him upon it ;

That tho' he was forced to consent to a Peace, yet, in his Orders to the Duke of *Ormond* for concluding it, it is expressly provided, that his Protestants should be secured, and his Regal Authority preserved ;

That the utmost Enlargement of Powers, which he gave to the *Duke*, consisted in allowing him to consent to a *Suspension of Poining's Act for a Time, and a like temporary Repeal of the penal Laws against the Roman Catholics* ; and

That tho' he thought no Condition too hard for the Rebels in *England* and *Scotland* (they being irreclaimable and obstinately persisting in their Rebellion) yet he would neither do nor consent that any Thing should be done against his Conscience or Honour.

These Circumstances considered, together with what hath been already offered in Proof of the King's sincere Attachment to the reformed Religion, I will leave the impartial Reader to determine, how far this Charge affects his Majesty's Character.

But

But the GRAND CHARGE is still behind; and if it can be supported, I will readily acknowledge that the Enquirer's Deduction of Authorities and Evidences is a very faithful one, or, which is much the same, that two and two make five. However I verily think, there will be no great Fear of my being put upon such Difficulties. When the Links of a Chain are once shattered and broken, it may possibly dwindle and be metamorphosed into a Rope of Sand.

I have seen much more surprizing Things done by a Person whose Name the Enquirer can be no Stranger to. He would in a very dextrous manner, impose *Counters* upon Gentlemen for *Gold* and *Silver*, transform the same Gold and Silver into Counters, and in a Trice cause the whole to disappear and vanish into nothing.

He would swallow or pretend to swallow such Materials, as no Mortal ever swallowed before, and disgorge them with as much Ease, as the Story of the *Devil* and *Oliver Cromwell* was swallowed and gravely published not many Years ago. However this Artist's Tricks were generally very inoffensive. He seldom did himself or his Spectators any great Harm. He only surprized or diverted them; he only made weak People stare, and Men of Sense laugh, and shewed himself to be a great Master of the Art of Legerdemain. Indeed he got a Livelihood by it; and what further Views he had in taking up with such a disreputable Employment I could
never

never learn. I have seen him shuffle and cut with a most amazing Dexterity.

The *Great Charge* against King *Charles* is as follows. The Enquirer, for fear his Readers should find it difficult to *swallow* the above Imputations upon his Majesty, endeavours to fix them upon him by an Artifice, which will deserve peculiar Notice. He insinuates,

1. That the *Marquis* of *Ormond* himself suspected his Majesty's Principles in Point of Religion, and that he signified as much in a Letter to Lord *Digby*.

2. That it was owing to the *Marquis's* Zeal for the Protestant Religion (not to his Majesty's) that the *Irish* Rebels had not the Terms granted them which they insisted upon.

3. That the King had given Orders for making a Peace more agreeable to the *Irish*, that he strongly desired it, for as much as he wanted their Assistance; but that the *Marquis* of *Ormond* was too zealous a Protestant to pay an implicit Obedience to the King's Orders.

4. That the King therefore finding, that he had little Reason to expect that the *Marquis* would consent to the Terms of the *Irish* Rebels, or that they would condescend to his, resolved to employ a zealous *Roman Catholic*, the Earl of *Glamorgan*, to grant the *Irish* their own Terms with regard to Religion.

These Insinuations to a Person, who is acquainted with our History, must look very surprising; they being absolutely false and groundless. In order therefore to satisfy the Reader
that

that I do the Enquirer no Injustice in this Respect, I will beg Leave to give him the Charge in the Enquirer's own Words.

" The Author of the Nuncio's Memoirs, says
 " he, in several Places complains of the Mar-
 " quis for not following the King's Orders in
 " making Peace with the *Irish*, tho' he knew
 " how strongly his Majesty desired it, and how
 " much he wanted their Assistance *.

" But the Marquis of Ormond was so zea-
 " lous a Protestant, that he was absolutely averse
 " to the granting of the Terms, upon which
 " the *Irish* Rebels insisted. And this Firmness
 " of his in that Respect, even at a Time of the
 " King's extreme Distress, is evident from a
 " Letter of his Lordship to Lord Digby 1646,
 " in which was the following Passage.—*One*
 " *Thing I shall beseech you to be careful of,*
 " *which is to take Order, that the Commands,*
 " *that shall be dictated to me, touching this*
 " *People (if any be) thwart not the Grounds I*
 " *have laid to myself in Point of Religion; for*
 " *in that, and in that only, I shall resort to the*
 " *Liberty left to a Subject to obey by Suffering.*
 " *And this I mention, lest the King's Service*
 " *should suffer in my Scrupulousness in Things,*
 " *another would find less Difficulty in †.*

" The King therefore having little Expectation
 " that his Lordship would consent to the Terms
 " of the *Irish* Rebels, or that they would con-
 " descend to his, resolved upon a Method of

* Enquiry, p. 12.

† Ibid. p. 13.

" satisfying

“ satisfying the *Irish* without the Intervention
 “ of the *Lord Lieutenant*.

“ To this Purpose, while the Marquis of
 “ *Ormond* was labouring with great Earnestness
 “ to persuade them to desist from part of their
 “ Demands, the King resolved to employ se-
 “ cretly with them *Edward Somerset Lord*
 “ *Herbert Earl of Glamorgan*.”

“ That this *Earl* being a zealous *Roman*
 “ *Catholic*, was thought the most proper Per-
 “ son to negotiate a Peace with the *Irish*, and
 “ to grant them their own Terms with regard
 “ to Religion.”

Now would not any one conclude from this Representation of the Affair, that the Marquis really suspected the King's Principles in Point of Religion? and that the Precaution in his Letter to Lord *Digby* related to some Commands, which might possibly be sent him from his Majesty? Does not the Reason, which the *Enquirer* gives for the King's resolving to employ the Earl of *Glamorgan*, plainly imply, that he (the *Enquirer*) intended to make his Readers believe, that the Precaution taken by the Marquis, was designed to guard against any Commands, which he might receive from his Majesty, prejudicial to the Protestant Religion?

The Marquis's Letter is no sooner cited by the *Enquirer*, but a Consequence is immediately drawn and an Insinuation suggested in Prejudice to his Majesty. THE KING THEREFORE *having little Expectations, that the Marquis of Ormond would consent to the Terms of the Irish*
Rebels,

Rebels, &c. resolved to employ secretly the Earl of Glamorgan. Base Infination!

The King was then a Prisoner in the Hands of the *Scots*, and from whom the Marquis of *Ormond* had not the least Apprehension of any such Orders. On the other Hand, he was as thoroughly satisfied of his Majesty's Firmness and Zeal for the Church of *England*, as he was of his own. When the King's Affairs were utterly ruined, and the Duke was going to leave *Ireland*, when he was ready to banish himself from his Country for the Good of it, when consequently, next to the Words of a dying Man, his Words challenged Credit, he declared in the most solemn manner, that, in all the Time he had the Honour to serve the King his Master, he never received *any Command from him but such as bespoke him a wise, pious, protestant Prince, zealous of the Religion he professed.*

The Marquis's Letter to the Lord *Digby* was writ in *December* 1646, when the King was in the utmost Distress and incapable of giving him the least Orders or Instructions; and the *Precaution* taken by the Marquis was to guard against any Commands prejudicial to the Protestant Religion which might possibly be sent him (not from the King, as the Enquirer knew very well) but from the Queen at *Paris*, upon whom the Marquis might possibly imagine, that the *Roman Catholics* there about her might have some undue Influence. But the impartial Enquirer has represented the Affair in such a Light, as to make his Readers believe, that the Marquis

was

was apprehensive he might receive Commands prejudicial to the Protestant Religion from the *King*. But, which is still worse, this base and disingenuous Misrepresentation of a Letter, writ in the Year 1646, is the Foundation, upon which the Enquirer proceeds to the Story of *Glamorgan*, and upon which he builds his conjectural Fabric, with Regard to the pretended Commissions and Powers which he would fain make his Readers believe, were entrusted with that unhappy Nobleman. This base Misrepresentation is urged as a Reason of the Marquis's Letter for *Glamorgan's* going into *Ireland* two Years before the Letter was wrote. The Precaution expressed in the Marquis's Letter of the 25th of *December* 1646, is urged (in Conjunction with the idle Conjectures and Speculations of a Roman Priest, absent from the Scene of Affairs) to shew the pretended Necessity of *Glamorgan's* being sent by the King to *Ireland* in 1644; *i. e.* about two Years before the Letter bears Date.

But not to insist further upon this Circumstance, and the absurd Consequences drawn from it, the Reader, I think, will expect that such barefaced Misrepresentation and Artifice should be set in a proper Light, which I shall in a very few Words endeavour to do.

The express Design of the Enquirer is to shew, that King *Charles* was privy to the Transactions of *Glamorgan*, and that he employed him secretly, to grant the *Irish* Rebels their own Terms in Point of Religion, &c.
And

And how does he prove it? Why, he gives us a Letter from the *Marquis of Ormond* to *Lord Digby*, wherein he would have it, that the Marquis himself has plainly intimated, that he suspected his Majesty's Protestant Principles; that the King, finding there was no great Success to be expected from the Negotiations of such a zealous Protestant, concluded to employ *Glamorgan* to grant the *Irish* Rebels their own Terms. But how does it appear, that the Marquis suspected his Majesty's Principles in Point of Religion? Why, in order to prove this Point, a Letter from the Marquis of *Ormond* is interpreted to a Sense, which the Marquis himself in a most publick and solemn Manner disavowed: The Marquis in Effect, assured the Privy Council in *Ireland*, that he never suspected his Majesty's Principles, nor ever had any Reason for it; he having expressly declared, that he *never received any Command from the King his Master, but such as bespoke him a wise, pious, protestant Prince, zealous of the Religion he professed.*

But what is equally material, the Marquis's Letter was writ at a Time, when his Majesty was a Prisoner under the strictest Confinement, when there was not the least Correspondence between the King and the Marquis, and when it was scarce possible, his Majesty could write to the Marquis, and when consequently the Marquis had not the least Reason to expect from him any Commands or Instructions whatsoever. So that the very first Evidence, which
the

the Enquirer has produced in Favour of his idle Conjectures, concerning *Glamorgan's* pretended Powers and Commissions from the King, appears to be founded on arrant Misrepresentation and Falshood. In what Light the Superstructure will appear, which is built upon such a notable Foundation, the Reader is left to guess.——

The Enquirer further insinuates, that *it was owing to the Marquis's Zeal for the Protestant Religion, (not to his Majesty's) that the Irish Rebels had not the Terms granted them, which they insisted upon.*

That *the King had given Orders for making a Peace more agreeable to the Irish; that he strongly desired it, for as much as he wanted their Assistance; but that the Marquis of Ormond was too zealous a Protestant to pay an implicit Obedience to the King's Orders,*

That *therefore the King, finding he had little Reason to expect, that the Marquis would consent to the Terms of the Irish Rebels, or that they would condescend to his; resolved to employ a zealous Roman Catholic, the Earl of Glamorgan, to grant the Irish their own Terms with Regard to Religion.*

And how does the Enquirer prove all this? Why,

1. From the King's own Letter, dated from *Oxford, December 27, 1644.* And,

2. From the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, wherein we are told, that the *Earl of Glamorgan* was employed by his Majesty to negotiate a Peace with

the *Irish*, and had Powers, Commissions, Letters, &c. for that Purpose.

1. Then let us examine his Majesty's Letter, and see what it contains.

Ormond,

" My Lord *Herbert* having Business of his
 " own in *Ireland*, (wherein I desire you to do
 " him all lawful Favour and Furtherance) I
 " have thought good to use the Power I have,
 " both in his *Affection and Duty*, to engage
 " him in all possible Ways to further the Peace
 " there, which he hath promised to do.
 " Wherefore, as you find Occasion, you may
 " confidently use and trust him in this, or any
 " other Thing *he shall propound to you for my*
 " *Service*; there being none in whose Honesty
 " and Zeal to my Person and Crown I have
 " more Confidence. So I rest

" *Your most assured*

" *constant Friend,*

Oxford, 27 Dec. 1644.

" CHARLES, R."

To this Letter was added the following Postscript in Cypher: " His *Honesty or Affection* to
 " my Service *will not deceive you*, but I will
 " not answer for his *Judgment*."

The natural Construction of this Letter, I think is plain and obvious. It is plain that his Lordship's private Affairs called him into *Ireland*. The King in the Letter expressly says as much. He desires the Marquis of *Ormond* to do him all lawful Favour and Furtherance in that Respect. And

And as *Glamorgan* was supposed to have a considerable Interest with the Roman Catholics in *Ireland*; it was natural enough for his Majesty, when his Lordship was going for *Ireland*, to recommend to him the employing his good Offices for accelerating the *Peace*, and the *Succours*, in such a Manner as *should be directed by the Lord Lieutenant*. And this his Majesty's Letter plainly implies, but nothing more. *I have thought good*, says he, *to use the Power I have both in his AFFECTION and DUTY to engage him in all possible Means to further the Peace there*. Here is no Commission given him; but the very Reverse is expressly implied in his Majesty's own Words. *I have thought good to use the Power I have, in his Affection and Duty, &c. i. e.* as he hath always made Professions of great Duty and Affection for my Service, I pressed him upon that Footing, and that only. I pressed him, that he would give me a Testimony of his Duty and Affection by using his Interest with his Friends in *Ireland* to further the Peace there.

Nor was he to do any Thing of this Kind *without the Intervention of the Lord Lieutenant*, as the Enquirer would insinuate; but to take his Directions in every Step, which he should imagine might be serviceable to his Majesty's Affairs. *As you find Occasion*, says the King, *you may confidently use and trust him in this, or any other Thing*, HE SHALL PROPOUND TO YOU FOR MY SERVICE. *His Honesty or Affection to my Service will not deceive you*; BUT I WILL NOT ANSWER FOR HIS JUDGMENT; plainly

intimating, that he had neither intrusted him, or thought him fit to be intrusted with any Powers, Commissions, Orders, or Instructions whatsoever, separate from, or independent of that Trust, which he had reposed with the Lord Lieutenant. And to this agree all his Majesty's Letters, his Declaration, &c. quoted by the Enquirer himself. (See *Enq.* p. 118, 119, 120, &c.)

For what Purpose then, it may be asked, does the *Enquirer* produce this Letter? Why, to insinuate, that *Glamorgan, when he went for Ireland, was charged with his Majesty's Affairs; that this was the chief and real Occasion of his Journey thither; that he was secretly employed by the King to grant the Irish their own Terms in Point of Religion, and to get the Irish Troops transported into England for his Majesty's Service, as soon as possible.*

If this Nobleman was really employed and sent by the King upon such an extraordinary Negotiation, I verily think there was never such a dilatory and unthinking Man sent upon such an important Affair since the Creation.

The Peace of *Ireland*, and the Succours from thence, were Matters of great Moment, which the King, as the Enquirer himself tells us, earnestly desired, and which could not be neglected without hazarding the Ruin of his Majesty's Affairs. And yet this noble Lord staid three Months afterwards in *England* or *Wales*. He staid long enough to raise two Regi-

Regiments, to get a Body of 1800 Foot, and, if I am not mistaken, 700 Horse together.

It is very plain from hence, that he had no Commission from the King for the Purpose pretended, and that the King laid no Stress upon his undertakings. And it is still more plain, that he had no such *Commission*, as he afterwards pretended to have in his Negotiation with the Pope's *Nuncio*. This is clear from his sending *Edward Bosden*, on *March 21*, 1644-5, to *Oxford*, (subsequent to the Dates of both his *pretended Commissions*) to solicit for a *Commission* to command in *South Wales*. But had he had the *extensive Commission*, which he pretended, what Occasion was there for a *Commission* to command in *South Wales*? But this Particular I shall have Occasion to mention hereafter.

The Enquirer however, *would fain make his Readers believe, that GLAMORGAN went to Ireland, not upon his own Business, but upon the King's Affairs.*

His Majesty, on the other Hand, says, in his Letter abovementioned, that the Lord *Herbert*, (alias *Glamorgan*) was going thither upon his own Business, and desires the Lord Lieutenant to do him all lawful Favour and Furtherance therein; yet notwithstanding this convincing Circumstance, and the long Stay which this Nobleman made in *Wales*: The Enquirer, with a surprizing Modesty, is pleased to give the King the Lie, and to assure his Reader, that *Lord Herbert* was sent expressly upon the King's

Affairs, in order to grant the Irish their own Terms with Regard to Religion. It is very hard to be put at such a Distance of Time, upon shewing what particular Business called a private Gentleman, above a Century ago, into *Ireland*; but to justify the King's Veracity, I shall beg leave to point out the very Business upon which he went thither.

Edward Lord Herbert had married, for his second Wife, *Margaret* Daughter of *Henry* Earl of *Thomonde*; who dying without Issue Male, was succeeded in his Honours by his Brother *Barnaby*; but left *Margaret* and her Sister, the Lady *Honora O'Brien*, by Will, as well as by a Deed of Settlement, 6000*l.* a-piece for their Fortunes. As these Ladies were *Co-heiresses* to their Father, divers Lands and Manors were conceived to descend to them, notwithstanding the Settlement. It was on this Account that *Honora*, being a Minor, became the King's Ward; and by the Mediation of Sir *Miles Fleetwood*, and *Geffrey Palmer*, Esq; on *February* 1, 1639-40, an Agreement was drawn up and signed for putting an End to all Disputes between the *Co-heiresses* and their Uncle *Barnaby*, who, not observing the Articles of it, nor paying their Fortunes, the Dispute was renewed. A Treaty however was carrying on between them by Letters and Messengers; and by a Letter of *Barnaby's* to the Lord Lieutenant, of *September* 30, 1644 *; it appears, that Lord *Herbert's* Man was then with him;

* M. 249, in the Custody of Mr. *Carte's* Executrix.

but

but this Way of treating producing no good Effect, the *Lord Herbert* and the *Lady Honora O'Brien* (who was much distressed in those troublesome Times for want of her Fortune, and scarce able to subsist) resolved to go over to *Ireland*, to take effectual Care of their Interests. Accordingly they went over thither in 1645; and as his Lordship was recommended by the King to the Duke of *Ormond*, so the *Lady Honora*, representing her Case in a Petition to his Majesty, he was graciously pleased to take her into his Protection, and to give her Letters (under the Signet, and undersigned by the Lord *Digby*, Secretary of State) to the said Lord Lieutenant *; “ desiring him first to treat
 “ with her Uncle in an amicable Manner,
 “ in order to persuade him to pay her Por-
 “ tion, and perform the Articles of Agree-
 “ ment; and in Failure thereof, to give her his
 “ utmost Aid and Assistance in the legal Me-
 “ thods she should be forced to take for ob-
 “ taining her Right; and in the mean Time
 “ to take Care, that no Grant pass from the
 “ Crown of any of the Lands in Question to
 “ the said *Barnaby*, Earl of *Thomond*, till he
 “ had certified the King, that the said Lady
 “ had obtained full Satisfaction for her Dues,
 “ and should have received the King’s Orders
 “ therein.” These Facts contained in the Letters and Petition, referred to in the Margin, (the Originals whereof are now in the Custody of Mr. *Carte’s* Executrix) shew in the clearest

* P. 232. 235, 236.

Manner; that the Lord *Herbert* went to *Ireland* on his own private Affairs, and that the particular Business which carried him thither, was to force *Barnaby* Earl of *Thomond* to perform the Articles of Agreement above mentioned, in which Lady *Herbert* and her Sister *Honora* were equally interested.

Nothing more, I presume, needs be said, to shew that the Use, which the Enquirer hath made of the above Letter, is neither to his Purpose, nor his Credit.

I am now to examine a Charge against his Majesty, which I verily believe was never before advanced by any Person, who had Pretensions to critical Skill in History, to Learning, or Integrity.

The Enquirer tells us, *King Charles finding that the Duke of Ormond was too zealous a Protestant to comply with the Demands of the Irish Rebels, secretly employed and authorized the Earl of Glamorgan to negotiate a Peace with the Irish, and to grant them their own Terms in Point of Religion.*

But how does he prove this? Why, from the Memoirs of *Rinuccini* the *Pope's Nuncio* in *Ireland*; wherein we are told, that the *EARL had Powers, Commissions, Letters, &c. from the King for that Purpose.*

But how came the *Nuncio* by this Piece of Knowledge? Had he any Connexion with the King — with his Secretaries, with the Lord Lieutenant, or indeed with any one in whom his Majesty reposed a Confidence? Did
any

any of these great Men acquaint the *Nuncio* with this Secret? No; the King, in his Declaration and in his Letters, disavowed any such Commission. The Secretary Sir *Edward Nicholas* declared, that *Glamorgan's* pretended Commission was either *surreptitiously gotten, if not worse*. Lord *Digby's* Declarations were to the same Purpose, and the Lord Lieutenant and Council of *Ireland* arrested him for pretending to such a Commission *.

But the Evidence of the *Nuncio* himself in this Respect, is too material to be omitted. He owns in Effect, that the King and Queen had a very unfavourable Notion of his Nunciature; that they were utterly averse to his going for *Ireland*, or intermeddling in the Affairs of the Kingdom. The King and Queen, says the Compiler of the Memoirs, upon the first Account, which they received of the *Nuncio's* being appointed to go for *Ireland*, entertained a Jealousy, lest the Pope, under the Pretence of extirpating Heresy, should attempt to deprive his Majesty of that Kingdom. For which Reason they *used all their Endeavours to prevent the Nuncio* from going thither, or at least to make a Peace with the *Irish* Catholics before he should arrive there. (*Enq.* p. 34.)

How then could the *Nuncio* be assured that *Glamorgan* was really employed by the King? That the Powers and Commissions, which he pretended to have received from his Majesty,

* The trifling Objections made by the Enquirer to this particular shall be considered hereafter.

were genuine? As he had no Connection with the King or Queen or any Person in whom his Majesty reposed a Confidence, how could he be assured of this Particular? Why, from *Glamorgan* himself. So that the whole Affair rests upon the Credit of *Glamorgan*, in Opposition to the most public and solemn Declarations of the King himself; to the Testimony of his Secretaries, Lord *Digby* and Sir *Edward Nicholas*; to the Conduct of the Lord Lieutenant and the Council of *Ireland*, who publicly arrested the Earl, as guilty of High Treason, for pretending to the very Powers, which the Enquirer has imposed upon the World for genuine.

And yet the *Enquirer* will have it, *that Glamorgan's Commissions were really granted by the King*; and expressly tells us, *that for the Charge of Forgery brought against the EARL by Mr. Carte, not the least Proof is produced; and that it is effectually overthrown in one capital Instance, objected to his Lordship, by the Patent granted to the Lord Herbert, and published by Mr. Collins in both Editions of his Peerage of England.*

Mr. *Carte* was much better able to answer for himself than I can pretend to, but long before his Death he had little Leisure to attend to such Disputes: He was employed in a much more laborious and valuable Work, which, as far as he has gone, deserves the Thanks of every intelligent Member of the Commu-

Community, and cannot fail to transmit his Name to Posterity with great Honour *.

As to the present Question, tho' I differ widely from Mr. Carte in some Things, yet I own I agree with him in this, *that Glamorgan's pretended Commissions were Forgeries*; and I doubt not, but the Reader will soon be of my Opinion; will soon be convinced, that the Imperfections, Blunders, &c. which the Enquirer hath endeavoured to fix upon Mr. Carte, are *entirely his own*.

* The present Age (amidst all their Foibles) have made great Advances in critical and useful Knowledge. Prejudice and Party-nonsense begin to be treated with that Contempt, which they deserve. Men of Sense, who read for Information, who make Truth their sole Aim and Pursuit, who have studied the antient Greek and Latin Writers, and observe, that the chief Advantage which they had above the Moderns, consisted in a Strength of Thought, in a Simplicity and Propriety of Diction, are now generally very capable of distinguishing between a *noble, well writ History*, and a *Collection of old idle Tales*, *tho' never so well told*.

They can easily see the Difference between *sound Learning*, and *vain, empty, gasconading Pretensions* to it; between a *masterly Knowledge* of the Customs, Antiquities, and Constitution of their Country, and a *superficial Account* of Laws, Customs and Institutions, neither explained nor understood.

They can easily see the Difference between that *Strength of Argument*, *that judicious Determination of historical Difficulties*, and *those contemptible Efforts of ludicrous Drollery*; *those sorry Reasonings*, *that disjointed Stuff*, which we meet with in Party Writers, who first raise a Dust to blind the Eyes of their Readers, and then take as much Pains to impose upon them *idle Conjectures for real Facts*, *Mistakes for Truths*, as others do to set Facts and Truths in a clear Light.

To unravel the deep, designing Intrigues of Statesmen, to discuss the *most learned and intricate Points of Antiquity*, is a Work of Judgment, which must unavoidably engage the Attention and Esteem of the sensible World; whilst the *low, paultry Artifice* of Men, whose chief Talent lies in *skimming over* and *evading* the main Points in Question; in leaving Difficulties, as they *found* them; in entertaining their Readers either with *absurd*,
It

It is very evident, I presume, that the *Nuncio* could know nothing of the genuine Nature of Lord *Herbert's* (*alias Glamorgan's*) Commissions, but what *Glamorgan* told him. If therefore it shall appear, that this Nobleman imposed upon the *Nuncio*, that his pretended Commissions were undoubted Forgeries, I am in Hopes the *Enquirer* for the Future will be less fond of Conjectures, which have an evident Tendency to encourage Faction and Schism, to asperse the Memory of a pious, protestant Prince, and to undermine that excellent Church for which he died a Martyr, and to which, if I am rightly informed, the *Enquirer* belongs.

Give me Leave therefore to examine the *Earl's* Commissions, &c. distinctly. But before I enter upon this Examination, it will not be improper to take Notice of a Circumstance or two, which may possibly make the Conduct of this Nobleman appear less surprising than it does at present.

conjectural Mistakes, or else with *florid, elaborate, harmonious* *Notings*, cannot fail to be despised and disregarded.

A Diction suited to the Dignity of History is none of the least of those Qualifications required in a good Writer; and of this the present Age are competent Judges. A nervous, manly, noble, perspicuous Style (like that of a fine Piece of Painting, done by a masterly Hand) is easily discernible, and seldom escapes the Notice of intelligent Men. They can easily see the Difference between a *Livy* and a *Lucius Florus*; and if a Taste for true Learning continue in this Kingdom, Mr. *Carte's* History of *England* will in all Probability be the chief History read, at least esteemed by Men of Learning and unprejudiced Minds, when the *voluminous Collections* and *paultry Libels* of some others will either be utterly laid aside, or only read to be despised and laughed at.

The

The *Enquirer*, from Lord Clarendon, tells us, " That Lord *Herbert* (*alias Glamorgan*) " was generally beloved, as being a very good " natured Man, and obliging to all; that he " was very zealous for his Majesty's Service, and " had a more than ordinary Reverence and Affection to his Person; that upon the breaking out of the War between the King and Parliament, he was made Lord Lieutenant of *South Wales*; and that he raised at his own and his Father's Expence, a Body of 1500 Foot, and near 500 Horse for the King."

This Account makes it still more surprising that a Person, who was so zealously attached to the King's Service, should act a Part, which was one great Cause of the Ruin of his Majesty's Affairs. I shall therefore offer a Word or two which will in some Measure account for, at least take off from the Difficulty, and shew how this unhappy Nobleman might be induced to engage in Measures so prejudicial to his Majesty's Interest.

First then, it is certain that he was a zealous *Roman Catholic*. He was *ter Catholicus*, says the *Nuncio*; and in another Place this Writer speaks of his Zeal for Popery in such strong Terms, as may deserve the Reader's Notice*.

Lord Clarendon tells us, that *he had the Mis-*

* —Rex demum expirans, ante mortalium penè reliquos de se optimè meritum, & probatiorem auro obrizo catholicum, qui Ibernix foederatis, dum in rebelles succurrerent, nihil propè denegaret, — Glamorganum deputavit. Fol. 1047.

fortune to be bred up amongst the Jesuits; a Set of Men, who, in the Choice of Means necessary for the Ends which they have in View, are not generally thought to confine themselves to the strictest Rules of Morality. He was besides a Man of excessive Vanity, and an enthusiastic Turn of Mind, as will appear immediately. Now as the Jesuits had been intrusted with his Education, and knew him thoroughly, is it unlikely that they would take Advantage of his Foibles, and improve them to Purposes, which they had so much at Heart, and for which the Nuncio was sent into Ireland? Is it likely, that they would forget to let him know, what great Honour he must acquire, by promoting the Interest of, what they called, the Catholic Religion? how highly, by such a Conduct, he must ingratiate himself with his Holiness at Rome? how vastly the Credit of such a Testimony of his Zeal and Piety would exceed any secular Employments or Honours, which he could possibly have in View? That there is nothing absurd in these Questions, the Enquirer himself hath shewn us, he having justly intimated, that the Papists seldom stick at any Thing to promote their Cause in Point of Religion. We see, says he, how ready the restless and encroaching Spirit of Papery is, to excite or heighten the public Confusions, by fomenting Rebellion at one Time, and courting and exalting the Prerogative at another, as best suits its main Design of establishing the most absolute Tyranny

ranny over the Conscience and Reason of Mankind. (Pref. to the Enq. p. 8.)

2dly, Glamorgan was perhaps as fit an Instrument to be employed in furthering the Nuncio's Designs in *Ireland*, as any one Man in the King's Dominions. Amidst all his Professions of Duty and Affection for his Majesty, his natural Vanity and his great Zeal for the Popish Religion were still uppermost. His Ambition to do something for the Honour and Service of the Church of *Rome*, was carried to the greatest Height, even to a Degree of enthusiastic Madness.

He was really a Nobleman to be pitied. His extraordinary Faith is a clear Proof, that he was something disordered in his Senses. He believed, that he was destined by Providence to be the Conqueror of *Turkey*, and the Restorer of King *Charles* to all his Rights in *Great Britain*. What Influence these wild Imaginations might have upon his Conduct, is difficult to say. This is certain, that after his extravagant Project was discovered, and his Measures were in some Degree disconcerted; after he was arrested at *Dublin*, and obliged to produce his pretended Commissions to the Lord Lieutenant, he grew much worse, and his Actions were very unaccountable. After this Period, he was guilty of such shocking Prevarication, such a dishonourable, preposterous, and inconsistent Behaviour, as we can scarce suppose him to have been capable of, unless at the same Time we suppose that his Head was really turned. That this was his unhappy Case,

is

is clear from a Book, which he published *A. D.* 1663, and which was reprinted in 1746, intituled, A CENTURY OF THE NAMES AND SCANTLINGS OF INVENTIONS, &c. There are prefixed to it two Dedications; the *first* to the King; the *latter* to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes of the Houſe of Commons, now aſſembled in Parliament, ſigned WORCESTER; written in the very Style of the Man, who formerly aſſumed the Title of the Earl of Glamorgan; preſſing them to employ him in putting his Discoveries in Execution; aſſuring them, that the Nation would be enriched thereby, and mighty Anvantages would accrue to the public Service; and this, with as much Pomp and Confidence, as he uſed on other Occaſions, when he was minded to extol his own Merits and Services. There never was ſurely ſuch a Medley of Stuff collected together in one Book. It is ſo full of ſenſeleſs Pretenſions and Undertakings, of Falſities, Abſurdities, Contradiſtions, and Impoſſibilities, that, if any Man of common Senſe will take the Pains to read it, I think he cannot be greatly ſurprized, that the Author ſhould pretend to Commiſſions, which had a Tendency to gratify his Vanity, and flatter him that he was employed in the very Deſign, for which he fancy'd he was deſtined by Providence. I know not whether the *Enquirer* hath ever read this Work of the *Hero of his Performance*. If he hath, it muſt give the World Reaſon to entertain a very mean Opinion, either of his Underſtanding

derstanding or his Probity. A Man who, after reading such a Heap of serious Nonsense, can lay any Stress upon *Glamorgan's* Letters, Pretences, or Undertakings, must, I verily think, have a Degree of Faith equal to the miraculous Faith of *Glamorgan* himself. It is impossible surely, after a Man has perused this unparalleled Performance, that he can pay the least Regard to what the unhappy Author either did, professed, pretended or undertook, tho' in the most solemn, pompous, and confident Manner.

3. I shall only trouble the Reader with a Word or two more, and proceed directly to the Examination of the Letters, Commissions, &c. which the Enquirer has given us for genuine. It may possibly be asked, How *Glamorgan* could be furnished with those Signs-manual, which he made use of, during his Negotiation with the Pope's *Nuncio*? To this the Answer is easy and obvious. When the two Houses of Parliament took up Arms against the King, his Majesty was in the utmost Distress for want of Money to pay an Army, and even to subsist his Household or provide for his Table. He laboured, tho' not always in the same Degree, under the like Difficulty, during all the War; as appears plainly from Abundance of Passages in Lord *Clarendon's* History of the Rebellion. Hence it came, that a great Number of the *Signs-manual* were issued out for the borrowing of Money, and intrusted with different Persons. The Fact is indisputable, there being several of them still preserved in some honourable Families, descended of An-

cestors who distinguished themselves by their Loyalty in King *Charles's* Service. Some of them are filled up and the particular sums specified, others not; and this as low down as the Time of the King's Imprisonment in the *Isle of Wight*.

Now it is universally agreed, that no body advanced such extraordinary Sums of Money to the King in his Distress, as the *Marquis of Worcester*, and his Son the *Lord Herbert*; and consequently no body was so likely as they to be intrusted with a Number of those Signs-manual. Hence in all probability arose the Fund, that supplied the *latter* with the Warrants and pretended Powers, which he thought fit to produce to the *Nuncio*; and hence, it is highly probable, he had the Vanity to assume the Title of Earl of *Glamorgan*, before the Patent had passed the Great Seal. As the King had intrusted him with Signs-manual, and shewn him other Marks of Favour, I think there is no Absurdity in supposing, that a Man of *Glamorgan's* Turn of Mind, would pretend to Powers, which appeared to have the least Tendency to promote those grand Undertakings, for which he fancied he was destined by Heaven. Assuming the Honour of an *Earldom*, would in the Imagination of a Person, who had such romantic Designs in View, who apprehended he was doing his Majesty the greatest Services, be deemed in all likelihood, a trifling Equivalent for such exalted Merit.

However, I own, these Circumstances only prove,

prove, that this unhappy Nobleman was as likely as any one to engage in Measures which gratified his Vanity; not that he was *actually* guilty of what is laid to his Charge. His Zeal for Popery, tho' never so great, his Connexion with the *Jesuits*, and his unhappy Turn of Mind, are no absolute Proofs that his pretended Commissions were Forgeries. The Question therefore still remains, whether the *Commissions, that he pretended to, were forged*; which Point, I am next to consider.

The Powers, which *Glamorgan* pretended to, consisted of *Letters* and *Warrants* from the King, and a Patent, creating him Earl of *Glamorgan*, &c. in all which are such evident Marks of Forgery, as makes it amazing that any Man, who hath Pretensions to the Character of a Scholar, should venture to risk his Reputation, by imposing them upon the World as *genuine*.

The *Letter* cited and translated by the *Enquirer* (p. 28, 30.) is evidently spurious, and in Effect owned to be such by the Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs* (one of those best Authorities which the *Enquirer* boasts of in his Title-Page) as will be shewn immediately. And yet the *Enquirer* in Contradiction to this and common Sense, is not ashamed to ascribe it to King *Charles*, as its Author. This Letter is said to be dated at *Oxford*, April 30, 1645, and was presented to the *Nuncio* the 27th of *December* following by *Glamorgan*, who shewed him at the same Time another Letter sealed, which he

pretended came likewise from the King and was addressed to the Pope *.

The *Nuncio* could not comprehend the Meaning of such a Letter being sent to him, nor conceive either how the King should be *so eager for a Peace and Succours in April*; or if he was, why so many Months should pass, before the Letter was delivered. He was still more at a Loss to account, why a Letter dated so many Months before, should be sent to him to transmit to the *Pope*, when there was a much readier and easier Way of sending it, by the Canal of the *Queen*, who was then at *Paris*. His Suspicions about it were such, that he absolutely refused to transmit it, when he sent a Copy of his own to *Cardinal Pamfilio*. This last addressed to himself, he made at first a Scruple of receiving, as coming from an *heretical Prince*; but this Difficulty was soon removed by reflecting, that he was empowered to treat with Heretics. He would not however answer it, without the *Pope's* express Leave, which doth not appear to have been ever given, the *Court of Rome* probably deeming the Letter to be a Forgery.

As the *Letter* to the *Nuncio* was never answered, so *that* to the *Pope* was never sent, but sunk by *Glamorgan*; the Reason whereof the *Nuncio* could not comprehend; tho' in all Probability, *Glamorgan* did not care to send it, for fear his unfair Practices should be discovered.

* *Nuncio's Memoirs*, 1002.

As

As to the *other Letter*, which was presented to the *Nuncio*, *Glamorgan* had left *Oxford* long before the Date of it, and no Account is given, *how he came by it*, or *why the Nuncio did not receive it at Paris*.

It was dated *April 30, 1645*, and the *Nuncio* did not arrive at *Paris*, till *May 22*, where he staid above four Months; and yet there is not the least Reason assigned, why it was not sent him thither, tho' it required Expedition, and the King is represented as earnestly desirous of a Peace and Succours in *April*.

But what is equally material, at the Time when the Letter is pretended to have been wrote, no body could tell what was become of *Glamorgan*. It appeared afterwards, that he was in extreme Danger of being taken by a Parliament Ship*; that after getting with great Difficulty into a Port of *Cumberland*, he kept private in *Shepton Castle* in *Craven*, whence he went directly to *Ireland*, though the Ship in its Way was forced to touch at *Beaumaris*. Is it possible to conceive, either that a Letter should be sent to this Nobleman in such a Situation, in order to be delivered to the *Nuncio*, or indeed, that it should be wrote before the *latter* was arrived at *Paris*, and before it was known whether he could, or could not, be stopped from proceeding on his Voyage to *Ireland*?

The *Contents* of the Letter plainly point out *Glamorgan* for its Author. None but that unhappy Nobleman could have expressed himself

* Life of the Duke of *Ormond*, Vol. III. No. 389.

in such a vain, idle Manner; none but *Glamorgan* could have talked of *having twenty Years Acquaintance with the King*, of *advancing signally all that Time in his Esteem*, of *having more of his Confidence than all the World besides*; and *outdoing all his Majesty's Subjects in every Respect*.

The *Style* of the Letter is liable to great Exceptions: King *Charles* understood the *French* perfectly well. It was the Language in which he frequently conversed and treated with Ambassadors. He spoke it with Ease, and wrote it with Propriety and Elegance. His Style was noble, manly, clear and concise; whereas the *French* in this Letter is bald, uncouth, and so improper, as shews plainly, that the Writer was a Stranger to the *Neatness* and *Delicacy* of the *French* Tongue. The Diction is so low, intricate, tedious and confused, that far from being worthy of the finest Writer of the Age (for such King *Charles* was) it is scarce equal to *Glamorgan's* own, tho' it is writ entirely in the Manner of his other Letters.

Would any King of *England*, speaking of two of his Kingdoms, put *Ireland* before *England*? This Preference smells too much of the national Spirit of the Irish Priest, who served *Glamorgan* for his Secretary, as the whole Letter doth of that Nobleman's Passion for getting into the Nuncio's good Graces, for recommending himself and his Design to the Countenance and Approbation of a Person employed by the Pope.

And

And yet the *Enquirer*, that great Critic and Scholar, has not scrupled to give us this Letter as a genuine Letter of King *Charles's*, and in Effect demanded Proofs of its being forged. I shall therefore add to what has been said already, a Proof, which I think can admit of no just Exception, it being taken from the *Enquirer's* Favourite Author, the Compiler of the *Nuncio's* Memoirs.

This Writer at the End of *Glamorgan's* Negotiations, Pretences and Undertakings, makes some Reflections upon them. Page 2212, he says that the *Nuncio*, at the latter End of 1649, after his Return * from *Ireland* to *Rome*, drew up a Relation † of Affairs during his Nunciature, by the Order of *Innocent* the Xth. In this Relation he tells that Pope, that *no Foundation could be built on the Powers granted GLAMORGAN, which all consisted in blank Sheets and Concessions under the Sign-manual, which had no Force at all in Law.* To this I must add, says he, that the *FRENCH LETTER* wrote in the King's Name from Oxford, April 30, 1645, was wrote (for I have the Autographon or Original, and know the Hand-writing for certain) by Glamorgan's Secretary, no Fool, who also wrote a great many of the other Papers, which passed between Glamorgan and the Nuncio, generally in Latin and Italian, which he understood much better than he did French; so that, I believe, the foresaid Letter of the King's was one of those blank Sheets signed with others in

* *Nuncio's* Memoirs, fol. 2875. † Relat. c. 7.

England by the King, but THAT THE REST OF THE LETTER WAS WROTE IN IRELAND in a French barbarous enough.

Can any one desire a better Testimony of the Letter's being spurious, than is here given? A Person, *who had the Original in his Hands, who knew the Person that wrote it and his Hand-writing for certain, who had Reason to know where the Secretary (whose Post attached him constantly to his Lord's Person) was at the Time of the Date, expressly tells us, that the Letter was drawn up and written in Ireland, in a Country never honoured with King Charles's Presence.*

It may not be improper to observe in this Place, that this was the only *original Writing* pretended to be the King's, which *Glamorgan* delivered to the *Nuncio*. He gave him only Copies of his pretended Powers and Commissions. Had the Compiler seen the Originals, or had he not been restrained by his Tenderneſs for the Honour of the *Nuncio* (who was evidently imposed upon) he had probably made the same Judgment of *Glamorgan's* Powers and Commissions, as he did of the Letter to the *Nuncio*. He seems, however, to give no Credit to them, or else he could not well have fallen into so gross a Mistake, as to say, that *Glamorgan* had no Children *, when the most extensive of those Commissions to *Glamorgan* contains an Engagement for a Marriage between the Princess *Elizabeth* and his Son *Plantagenet*.

* *Memoirs*, Fol. 1003, 1004, compared with Fol. 1571.

Some trifling Objections, which the Enquirer's fruitful Imagination hath enabled him to suggest on this Subject, will be sufficiently refuted in what will be said in Relation to *Glamorgan's* pretended Powers, whether under the *Great Seal* or the Sign-manual. At present it may be sufficient to offer a Word or two by Way of Reflection, upon what has been remarked already.

It is observable then, that the Letter under Consideration, has evident Marks of Forgery. It is clear,

That the *Nuncio* himself had no very favourable Opinion of it, and was surpris'd that such a Letter should be sent to him; but particularly, that so little Care should be taken to transmit a Letter to him, which required such Expedition;

That the Contents and the Style of it plainly shew it to be a forged Composition;

That several other Circumstances make it highly improbable, that it should be writ by the King;

That tho' it is dated from *Oxford*, and is pretended to have been writ by the King from thence, yet the Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs* has expressly told us, that, to his Knowledge, it was writ by *Glamorgan's* Secretary in *Ireland*, &c. And what is replied to these Proofs? Nothing, but what (if admitted) may be pleaded in Prejudice to the Credit of the most authentic Facts upon Record. Nothing but Conjectures, which are highly improbable, and Suppositions utterly groundless. It

It appears, that *Glamorgan* left *Oxford* before the Date of this pretended Letter ;

That the King at the Time, when the Letter bears Date, could not possibly know, where *Glamorgan* was ;

That it is highly improbable, that his Majesty at such a Conjunction would apply to *Glamorgan* to transact Affairs of the greatest Consequence ; that he would commission him to deliver a Letter, which required the utmost Expedition, to the *Nuncio* in *Ireland*, before his Arrival at *Paris*, and before his Majesty could possibly know, whether he would go to *Ireland* or not. But what is more material, an indisputable Proof is produced,

That the Letter was writ by *Glamorgan's* Secretary in *Ireland*. The Enquirer, pressed with this last positive Testimony, has endeavoured to elude its Force, by Cavils and Evasions, which shew him to be greatly distressed. He supposes, at least insinuates, that *Edward Bosden*, who was sent to *Oxford* with Instructions from *Glamorgan* (which he presented to his Majesty on *March 21, 1644*) might have been the Canal of Correspondence between his Majesty and *Glamorgan* ; and consequently might have conveyed this Letter to *Glamorgan*. But what Grounds has he for this Supposition ? None at all : On the other Hand he is forced to call in the Assistance of two other Suppositions equally groundless, in order to give the least Shadow of Probability to this.

He supposes, that this *Bosden* may have been

Glamorgan's Secretary, and that he staid at *Oxford* at least forty Days, after his Instructions were presented to his Majesty; viz. from *March* 21, 1644, to *April* 30, 1645, the Day when the Letter is dated.

“ This Secretary, says the Enquirer, might
 “ not improbably be the Person, who was sent
 “ to the King by the Earl of *Glamorgan*, after
 “ he left *Oxford*, to manage his Affairs and put
 “ his Majesty in mind of the Earl's Commis-
 “ sion, and who subscribed the Instructions
 “ above-mentioned by the Name of *Edward*
 “ *Bosden*.” But is it possible, that such con-
 jectural Stuff can be deemed sufficient to con-
 front express, positive Testimonies, and au-
 thentic Facts? or is there the least Shadow of
 Reason for such Suppositions? No; on the
 other Hand, *Glamorgan's* Secretary, it is certain,
 was a Priest, who by his Office was always at-
 tendant upon his Person, to write his Dis-
 patches. Such a one was very improper to be
 sent to sollicite the King and Council on the
 Subject of those Instructions, with which *Bos-*
den was charged, and which required either a
 military Officer, or at least a Gentleman of the
 Country to transact.

These Instructions (printed in the King's
 Cabinet opened, p. 19, 20, 21) are introduced
 by some of *Glamorgan's* confident Undertakings
 and Pretences of having vast Sums of Money
 and Quantities of Arms in readiness; in which
 there was no more Truth, than in the like Of-
 fers, which he made above a Year afterwards

to

to the Duke of Ormond*. But this by the by.

The Instructions themselves related only to *the Ease and Security of the Counties of Monmouth and South-Wales, the Regulation of the Forces, the Taxes and Contributions in those Parts, Exemptions from free Quarter and Exactions of Garrisons, the Quarters and Command of Troops*; Points very unfit to be treated by an Ecclesiastic, and which requiring an immediate Settlement, could not be delayed to the Time, that the Enquirer would fain prolong *Bosden's* Stay at Court, without terrible Inconveniences. *Glamorgan* moved indeed at the same Time for a Commission; but it was a Commission *only to command in the above-mentioned Counties*, which lay convenient for his landing, in case he could bring a Body of Forces from *Ireland*; but he was not gratified even in this Request; so that there is not the least Grounds to suppose that *Bosden* ever received any Letter to be convey'd to the *Nuncio*, or indeed any Commission, any Instructions, any Order whatsoever, for writing such a Letter.

Upon the whole, I think, it is clear, that the Letter was writ by *Glamorgan's Secretary*, and not by *the King*; that it was writ in *Ireland* and not in *Oxford*, as is pretended; these Facts being supported by positive Proofs, to which no Reply has been made, but Conjectures and Suppositions, utterly groundless and absolutely destitute of Reason and Probability.

* R. 33, and Duke of Ormond's Life, III, 460.

The Enquirer himself in one Place (p. 333) seems to acknowledge as much: And accordingly, in a very dextrous Manner, shifts his Argument, and has Recourse to such an Expedient as evidently betrays his Cause, and shews it to be absolutely indefensible. He would first make his Readers believe, *that King Charles wrote the Letter himself*, but finding that this Position was not to be supported, he insinuates, *that it might be writ by his Order*. Supposing, says he, the Writer (of the Memoirs) not mistaken in the Hand-writing, it does not follow from thence, that the Letter was an undoubted Forgery, since *it might be written by Order of the King, who indisputably signed it, or by Directions of the Earl of Glamorgan, authorized by his Majesty*.

And what has he offered in Proof of this *might-be* Suggestion? Why, another *might-be* Suggestion, which is utterly unreasonable and groundless, as hath been shewn above. "The Secretary (who wrote the Letter) says he, *might*, not improbably, *be* the Person, who was sent to the King by the Earl of Glamorgan, after he left Oxford, to manage his Affairs, and to put his Majesty in mind of the Earl's Commission, and who subscribed the Instructions above-mentioned, by the Name of *Edward Bosden*."

Whether any further Regard need be paid to such conjectural Trifling, the impartial Reader is left to judge. However, as the Enquirer is a Gentleman of Character, I shall pay him all
the

the Deference, that is due to his great Merits. Here then it is suggested,

First, That the *Letter* was undeniably signed by the King; and

2dly, That, if it was not writ by the King, it might be writ by his Order; or else,

3dly, By the Directions of *Glamorgan*; and

4thly, That *Glamorgan* might be authorized by his Majesty so to do.

That the *Letter* was writ by the Directions of *Glamorgan*, is what I verily believe to be true; and if it shall appear from the *Enquirer's* own Authorities, that this is the only true Suggestion in the whole, I think (to use his own elegant Words) *the Reverence due to Truth, superior to all personal Regards*, will strictly justify a free and fair Examination of such Positions, as I have good Reason to believe, are absolutely false.

First then, How does it appear, that this *Letter* was signed by the King? That the King's Name or Sign-manual was to it, is admitted, but does it follow from hence, that the King signed it? Did the King write the *Letter* or ever see it? No; the *Letter*, we are assured, was writ by *Glamorgan's* Secretary in *Ireland*; in a Country, which was never honoured with the King's Presence. And how then can the King be properly said to have signed it?

That *Glamorgan* was intrusted with a Number of *blank Sheets* signed with the Sign-manual is granted. The *Nuncio* declares, that his whole Authority consisted in such blank Sheets, &c. and

and Lord *Clarendon* has intimated in several Places, that the Signs-manual with which Lord *Herbert (Glamorgan)* and others were intrusted, were designed to be a kind of Security or Memorandum to those, who should think proper to advance any Sums of Money for the King's Service. And if *Glamorgan* abused his Trust, and applied them to other Purposes, to Purposes for which they were never intended; if he filled up the blank Sheets with Letters and Warrants which the King knew nothing of, and which he publicly and solemnly disclaimed, can the King be properly said to have signed such Letters and Warrants? Base Insinuation! and evidently calculated to mislead the unthinking Multitude, and asperse the Memory of an unfortunate and injured Prince.

It is not unpleasant to observe, what artful Pains the Enquirer hath taken to interpret, in Prejudice to the King, a Passage in the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, relating to the blank Sheets, &c. intrusted with *Glamorgan*. The Passage may be seen in the marginal Note below *. The Nuncio informed Pope *Innocent X.* that Lord *Glamorgan's* whole Authority, consisting of Blank Sheets and Concessions, signed and sealed with the King's Chamber and private Seal, his Majesty could not, according to Law, be bound

* De quo stupeo, quod ipsi singulariter intimus recensuit Innocentio X. Nuncius. "Non poterat, inquit, sterni fundamentum in foliis albis & concessionibus sigillo Regis cubiculario & privato signatis, quibus sua Majestas non poterat legitime obligari."

by them. We see here, says the Enquirer, are mentioned *Concessions signed and sealed with the King's Chamber Seal*, as well as *blank Sheets*. So that here the Enquirer would insinuate, that that the King intrusted *Glamorgan* not only with *Blank Sheets*, but with *Concessions* signed and sealed with his Chamber Seal.

But is there the least Grounds for such an Insinuation? Not the least: *Glamorgan* himself never pretended to any written *Instructions* or *Concessions* from the King; and the King solemnly and repeatedly declared, that he never gave him any, as hath been and will be more fully shewn hereafter.

The Meaning of the *Nuncio's* Words is plain and obvious. As the Vanity of *Glamorgan* would not probably suffer him to conceal from the *Nuncio* the Number of *Signs-manual*, with which the King had intrusted him, so it is certain, that in the Course of his Negotiations, he must have laid before him many of those Sheets filled up with such *Concessions* and Proposals, as related to the several Affairs which were transacted between them. The *Nuncio* therefore might very well say, that *Glamorgan* had no Power, but *what consisted in Blank Sheets and Concessions*, sealed with the King's Chamber Seal; but does it follow from hence, that the King furnished him with those *Concessions* or with any written *Instructions* whatsoever? No; it is almost certain that he did not.

Glamorgan himself was not so weak or so mad to assert such a Thing; but on the other Hand

Hand, in his Speech to the General Assembly, expressly calls them *his own Concessions, Concessions made and to be made by him*. So that here are Concessions made and to be made by Glamorgan; but could all or any of these be his Majesty's Concessions?

Could Concessions which were *to be made*, be *already made*; already signed by the King? Shocking Absurdity! And it is no less certain, that the Concessions which had been made and laid before the Nuncio, *were all Glamorgan's*, the King having publicly and solemnly declared them to be such; to be Concessions and *Articles, which Glamorgan had impertinently framed of his own Head, without the Consent, Privity, or Directions of his Majesty, or the Lord Lieutenant, or any of his Majesty's Council*.

After this public Declaration, had his Majesty furnished Glamorgan with Concessions signed and sealed with his Chamber Seal, is it conceivable that he would have suffered himself to have been imprisoned, to have been arrested, upon Suspicion of High Treason, provided he could have produced Concessions signed and sealed by the King? And yet it is well known, that he never produced, nor ever pretended to have any such Thing.

He pretended indeed to the King's Authority for what he had done, and what was afterwards to be done; but was never able to produce any Credential of this Kind; but only the *Signs-manual*, which were intrusted with

him for a very different Purpose; or else his *pretended Commissions*, which the King and his Secretaries openly disavowed, and which were undoubted Forgeries, as will be fully proved immediately.

To return therefore to the Letter above-mentioned. *If this Letter was not writ by the King, might it not be writ by his Majesty's Order?* or might not Glamorgan have been authorized to write it? No; and that for such Reasons, as, I think, are unexceptionable.

The King disavowed any such Order. He, more than once, declared, that he had given no Order, no Authority to Glamorgan, or any one, to treat or transact Affairs with the Nuncio, *without the Intervention of the Lord Lieutenant*. As therefore the Lord Lieutenant appears to have been an utter Stranger to this Letter, I think we may fairly conclude, that no Orders were given to Glamorgan, or any Man living, to write or deliver such a Letter to the Nuncio.

But what is still more remarkable, Glamorgan himself never pretended, that the King gave any Orders for writing such a Letter; but has in Effect owned, that the King gave no such Orders at all; he having expressly asserted, that it was writ by the King himself. In a Letter to the Nuncio (see Eng. p. 175) Glamorgan's Words are these: *I beseech (you) to consider the Authority granted your Lordship by his Holiness, and to recal to your Memory, the Letter written by the King my Master to*
your

your Lordship. Now, as *Glamorgan* has here acknowledged that the King wrote the Letter, he has in Effect owned, that the King gave no Orders about writing it. To suppose that his Majesty wrote a Letter, and gave Orders about writing the same Letter, is too gross an Absurdity to be easily swallowed. As therefore it is notorious, and hath been clearly proved, that the Letter *was not writ by the King*, the Consequence, I think, is plain and evident, *viz.* that the Letter *was an undoubted Forgery.*

There are three other Letters, which the Enquirer has imposed upon his Readers, as genuine, *viz.*

1. One supposed to be writ by the Duke of *Ormond* to Lord *Muskery*, dated *August 11, 1645.*

2. *Another*, said to be writ by the King to *Glamorgan*, dated the 5th of *April 1646.*

3. A third pretended to have been writ by his Majesty to that Nobleman, dated the 20th of *July*, from *Newcastle*, 1646.

Before I enter upon an Examination of these Letters, it may not be improper to let the Reader see, with what Intent they are inserted in the Enquiry, and what Use the Enquirer has made of them.

The Author's professed Design is, to enquire into the Share which King *Charles* had in the Transactions of the Earl of *Glamorgan*. In order therefore to shew, that the King was privy to, connived at, and in some secret Manner authorized that Nobleman's Practices in

Ireland, he produces these Letters to prove, that the King and the Duke of Ormond entertained a favourable Opinion of Glamorgan, not only before but after he had been arrested at Dublin, for negotiating a Peace with the Irish, and pretending to the King's Commission for that Purpose.

Agreeable to this, there is in the Duke of Ormond's Letter to Lord Muskery (besides other Compliments paid Glamorgan) the following Paragraph.

What I have to say of Glamorgan, in short is this, that I know no Subject in England, upon whose Favour and Authority with his Majesty, and real and innate Nobility, you can better rely, than upon his Lordship's. (See the Enq. p. 62, 63.)

The two next Letters being great Curiosities, I shall give them the Reader at large.

"Glamorgan,

*"I neither have Time to spare, nor do you
 "desire that I should repeat to you unnecessarily those Things, which I have so often said
 "to you. I refer you therefore to Digby, for
 "what is to be done; and assure you of my constant
 "Friendship for you, which I think more
 "necessary in this universal Defection of every
 "Body. But however that be, I am persuaded,
 "that you cannot doubt, but that I will perform
 "all the Instructions and Promises made to you
 "and the Nuncio.*

According to the Enquirer,
 this Letter bears Date
April 5, 1646.

*"Your most undoubted
 "and constant Friend,
 "CHARLES R."*

The next Letter is still more remarkable.

“ Glamorgan,

“ I am not so strictly guarded, but that if
 “ you send to me a prudent and secret Person,
 “ I can receive a Letter, and you may signify
 “ to me your Mind, *I having always loved your*
 “ *Person and Conversation*, which I ardently
 “ wish for at present more than ever, if it
 “ could be had without Prejudice to you, whose
 “ Safety is as dear to me as my own. *If you*
 “ *can raise a large Sum of Money by pawning*
 “ *my Kingdoms* for that Purpose, I am content
 “ you should do it; and if I recover them, I
 “ will freely pay that Money. And tell the
 “ Nuncio, *that if once I can come into his and*
 “ *your Hands, which ought to be extremely*
 “ *wished for by you both, as well for the Sake*
 “ *of England as Ireland, since all the rest, as I*
 “ *see, despise me, I will do it.* And if I do
 “ not say this from my Heart, or if in any fu-
 “ ture Time I fail you in this, may God never
 “ restore me to my Kingdoms in this World,
 “ nor give me eternal Happiness in the next;
 “ to which I hope this Tribulation will con-
 “ duct me at last, after I have satisfied my
 “ Obligations to my Friends; to none of whom
 “ I am so much obliged as to yourself, whose
 “ Merits towards me, exceed all Expression,
 “ that can be used by your constant Friend,

From Newcastle, July 20,
 1646.

“ CHARLES R.”

Before I remark upon these Letters, I shall appeal to the *Enquiry* itself for some Account of the Sentiments of the *King*, and the Duke of *Ormond*, with Regard to *Glamorgan*, and then proceed to a particular Examination, not only of the Letters above-mentioned, but of the Patent creating him Earl of *Glamorgan*, and his pretended Warrants.

If it shall appear, that the Behaviour of the *King* and the Duke of *Ormond* towards *Glamorgan* was very different, from what *these Letters* represent it to have been ; and that the Letters, Warrants, and Patent were all Forgeries ; it is presumed, that the Enquirer will, with the utmost Readiness, submit to the Force of Truth, and for the future *not be wanting* in a strict Regard to it ; it being certain, that the *Want of it in a Gentleman of the Enquirer's Abilities, would transform him into something worse, if possible, than the most criminal of Impostors.* (*Eng. p. 343.*)

First then, Let us see how the *King* behaved toward *Glamorgan* ; and here we are told, that his Majesty having received Information from the Lord Lieutenant, and Council of *Ireland*, that the Earl of *Glamorgan* had, without his Directions or Privity, entered into a Treaty with some Commissioners, on the *Roman Catholic* Party there, and also drawn up and agreed unto certain Articles with the said Commissioners, highly derogatory to his Majesty's Honour and royal Dignity, and *most prejudicial*

dicial unto the Protestant Religion and Church there in Ireland : His Majesty hath now thought fitting, the better to shew his clear Intentions, and to give Satisfaction to his said Houses of Parliament, and the rest of his Subjects in all his Dominions, to send this Declaration to his said Houses, containing the whole Truth of the Business, which is, that the Earl of *Glamorgan* having made Offer unto him to raise Forces in the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and to conduct them into *England* for his Majesty's Service, had a Commission to that Purpose, and to that Purpose only.

That he had no Commission at all to treat of any Thing else, without the Privy and Directions of the Lord Lieutenant, much less to capitulate any Thing concerning Religion, or any Propriety belonging either to Church or Laity :

That it clearly appears by the *Lord Lieutenant's* Proceedings with the said *Earl*, that he had no Notice at all of what the said Earl had treated and pretended to have capitulated with the *Irish*, until by Accident it came to his Knowledge. And his Majesty doth protest, that until such Time, as he had Advertisement, that the Person of the said Earl of *Glamorgan* was arrested and restrained, he never heard or had any Notice, that the said Earl had entered into any Kind of Treaty or Capitulation with those *Irish* Commissioners; much less, that he concluded or signed those Articles, so destructive both to Church and State, and so repugnant to

his Majesty's public Professions and known Resolutions. And for the further Vindication of his Majesty's Honour and Integrity herein, he doth declare, that he is so far from considering any Thing contained in those Papers, and Writings, framed by the said Earl, and those Commissioners, with whom he treated, as he doth absolutely disavow him therein, and hath given Commandment to the Lord Lieutenant, and the Council there, to proceed against the said Earl, as one who either out of *Falseness, Presumption, or Folly*, hath so hazarded the blemishing his Majesty's Reputation with his good Subjects, and so impertinently framed those Articles of his own Head, without the Consent, Privity, or Directions of his Majesty, or the said Lord Lieutenant, or any of his Majesty's Council there.

The next Day after the King's Declaration to the Parliament against that Earl, viz. Jan. 30, 164 $\frac{1}{2}$, his Majesty wrote the following private Letter to the Marquis of Ormond *.

“ Ormond,

“ I cannot but add to my long Letter, that,
 “ upon the Word of a Christian, I never intended Glamorgan should treat any Thing
 “ without your Approbation, much less without your Knowledge. For besides the Injury to you, I was always diffident of his Judgment (tho' I could not think him so extremely
 “ weak) as now to my Cost I have found, which
 “ you may easily perceive by the Postscript in a

* Carte, Vol. II. Append.

“ Letter

" Letter of mine to you, that he should have
 " delivered you at his last coming into *Ireland*,
 " which, if you have not had, the Reason of
 " it will be worth the knowing; for which I
 " have commanded *Digby's* Service, desiring
 " you to assist him. And albeit I have too just
 " Cause, for the clearing of my Honour, to
 " command (as I have done) to prosecute *Gla-*
 " *morgan* in a legal Way; yet I will have you
 " suspend the Execution of any Sentence against
 " him, until you inform me fully of all the Pro-
 " ceedings. For I believe, it was his *misguided*
 " Zeal, more than any Malice, which brought
 " this great Misfortune on him, and on us all.
 " For your Part, you have in this, as in all
 " other Actions, given me such Satisfaction,
 " that I mean otherwise, more than by Words
 " to express my Estimation of you. So I rest

Jan. 30, " Your most assured, constant,
 1645. " real Friend, CHARLES R."

In another Letter, which the *King* wrote the
 Day following to the *Lord Lieutenant* and *Coun-*
cil of *Ireland*, are these Words.

" CHARLES R.

" Right trusty and entirely beloved Cousin
 " and Counsellor, and right trusty and well
 " beloved Counsellors, we greet you well. We
 " have seen and considered the Dispatch directed
 " from you and our Council there to our right
 " trusty and well-beloved Counsellor Sir *Ed-*
 " *ward Nicholas*, one of our principal Secre-
 " taries

" taries of State, concerning the Earl of *Gla-*
 " *morgan's* Accusation, and your Proceedings
 " thereupon. And as we could not but receive
 " the one with *extraordinary Amazement*, that
 " any Man's *Folly* and *Presumption* should carry
 " him to such a Degree of abusing our *Trust*,
 " how little soever; so we could not but be
 " very sensible of the great Affection, and Zeal
 " to our Service, which you have expressed in
 " putting our Honour (so highly traduced) in-
 " to so speedy and effectual a Way of Vindica-
 " tion, by the Proceeding against the said Earl.

" The Truth is, being *very confident* of his
 " *Affections* and *Obedience*, we had not much
 " Regard to his Abilities, *since he was bound up*
 " *by our positive Commands from doing any Thing*
 " *but what you should particularly and precisely*
 " *direct him to, both in the Matter and Man-*
 " *ner of his Negotiation.*

" Wherefore our Pleasure is, that the *Charge*
 " *begun by our Secretary, according to his Duty,*
 " *be thoroughly and diligently prosecuted against*
 " *the said Earl, &c. &c.*

" Given at our Court at *Oxford* this 31st
 " Day of *January*, in the twenty-first
 " Year of our Reign, 1645.

" By his Majesty's Command,

" *Edward Nicholas.*"

The same Day, in a Letter from Secretary
Nicholas to the Lord Lieutenant and Council
 of *Ireland*, are the following Words.

" Since the *Warrant*, whereby his Lordship
 " [*Lord Herbert*] pretends to be authorized to
 " treat

“ treat with the *Roman Catholics* there, is not
 “ *sealed with the Signet*, as it mentions, nor
 “ *attested* by either of his Majesty’s *Secretaries*,
 “ as it ought, nor *written in the Style* that *War-*
 “ *rants* of that Nature use to be ; neither *refers*
 “ *to any Instructions at all* ; your Lordship can-
 “ not but judge it to be, at *least surreptitiously*
 “ *gotten, if not worse* ; for his Majesty saith,
 “ he remembers it not. And as the *Warrant*
 “ is a *very strange one*, so hath been also the
 “ *Execution* of it. For it is manifest, the
 “ *Lord Herbert* did not acquaint the Lord
 “ *Lieutenant* with any Part of it, before he con-
 “ cluded with the said *Roman Catholics* ; nor
 “ even advertised his Majesty, the Lord Lieu-
 “ tenant, or any of his Council here or there,
 “ what he had done in an Affair of so great
 “ Moment and Consequence, four Months be-
 “ fore, till it was discovered by Accident. This
 “ doth not sound like *good Meaning* ; and I am
 “ sure *is not fair Dealing*. But his Majesty
 “ having, by his Letter to your Lordship, left
 “ the Charge against the *Lord Herbert*, to be
 “ prosecuted by your Lordships, I shall say no
 “ more of that unhappy Subject.”

The same Day the *Secretary* wrote another
 Letter to the *Lord Lieutenant*, wherein he
 said * ;

“ We are all here much amazed at the News
 “ of the *Lord Herbert’s imprudent Action* (to
 “ say no more of it) which hath most ex-
 “ tremely prejudiced his Majesty, and his Af-

* Carte, p. 447.

“ fairs here. Your *Excellence* and the *Council*
 “ there, will herewith receive a full and par-
 “ ticular Relation from his Majesty, of all that
 “ he can call to Mind concerning that Busi-
 “ ness, wherein, as the *Lord Herbert* hath
 “ dealt very unworthily with his Majesty, so it
 “ is believed, that even the Roman Catholics
 “ themselves will condemn him for his impru-
 “ dent Proceeding therein. For if his pre-
 “ tended Warrant had been authentic, yet to
 “ do any Thing thereupon without your Ex-
 “ cellency's Privity, was a *Madness*, rather than
 “ a *Folly*; and the concealing so long, what
 “ he had done, argues something worse. The
 “ King hath commanded me to advertise your
 “ Lordship, that the *Patent*, for making the
 “ said Lord *Herbert* of Ragland, Earl of *Gla-*
 “ *morgan*, is not passed the *Great Seal* here,
 “ so he is no Peer of this Kingdom; notwith-
 “ standing he styles himself, and hath treated
 “ with the Rebels in *Ireland*, by the Name
 “ of *Earl of Glamorgan*, which is as vainly
 “ taken upon him, as his pretended Warrant
 “ if any such be) was surreptitiously gotten,
 “ And I am sure, that *Honour* cannot be pre-
 “ ferred upon him under the *Signet* (as firmly
 “ as under the *Great Seal*, to all Intents and
 “ Purposes) as his Lordship's pretended War-
 “ rant and Power is alledged to be, tho' there
 “ be no *Signet* to it.”

A Remark or two upon these Letters and De-
 clarations of his Majesty may not be improper.
 Here then it appears,

That

That the King shewed his Disapprobation of what *Glamorgan* had done, and resented his Behaviour in a proper Manner;

That in a Message to the two Houses he declared, that *that Nobleman had no Commission at all to treat of any Thing without the Privy and Directions of the Lord Lieutenant; much less to capitulate any Thing concerning Religion, or any Propriety belonging either to Church or Laity;*

That the King absolutely disavowed him therein, and gave Commandment to the Lord Lieutenant and the Council there to prosecute him;

That his Majesty made no Scruple to pronounce his Conduct to be the Result of Falseness, Presumption, or Folly;

That he declared, *that Glamorgan had hazarded the blemishing of his Majesty's Reputation with his good Subjects, and impertinently framed Articles of Peace of his own Head, without the Consent, Privy, or Directions of his Majesty, or the Lord Lieutenant, or any of his Majesty's Council there.*

Indeed his Majesty, in a Letter to the Duke of Ormond, as was said before, hath these Words:

Albeit I have too just Cause for the clearing of my Honour to command (as I have done) to prosecute Glamorgan in a legal Way; yet I will have you suspend the Execution of any Sentence against him, until you inform me fully of all the Proceedings.

The King, before *Glamorgan's* late Practices
I were

were discovered, having experienced his Fidelity and Affection to his Person and Service, like a Prince, tender of the Honour of a Subject who had never before misbehaved, was willing to impute his Practices rather to a *misguided Zeal*, than to any Malice. Accordingly he ordered that the *Execution of his Sentence* should be suspended, till he was fully informed of the Proceedings. Where it is observable, that he only ordered the *Execution of his Sentence* to be suspended. But does it follow from hence, that his Majesty was privy to his Negotiations, or approved of his Conduct? No; on the other Hand, he gave Orders the very next Day, that the Charge should be thoroughly and diligently prosecuted against him.

The Truth is, says his Majesty, being very confident of his Affections and Obedience, we had not much Regard to his Abilities, since he was bound up by our positive Commands from doing any Thing, but what you should particularly and precisely direct him to, both in the Matter and Manner of his Negotiation *.

* This Letter will serve to explain another, from the Duke of Ormond to Glamorgan, which the Enquirer has interpreted greatly to the Disadvantage of his Majesty and the Duke. In a Letter from his Grace to Glamorgan, dated Feb. 11. 1645; are these Words, *Your Lordship may securely go on in the Way you have proposed to yourself to serve the King, without Fear of Interruption from me, or so much as inquiring into the Means you work by.* The Enquirer from these Words would insinuate, that the Duke of Ormond was now satisfied, that Glamorgan acted by some secret Commission from the King; whereas the very Reverse of this is true. The Duke was thoroughly satisfied from Secretary Nicholas's Letter above-mentioned, dated Jan. 31. 1645, that Glamorgan had no Kind of Commission from the King, to

Wherefore

Wherefore our Pleasure is, that the Charge begun by our Secretary, according to his Duty, be thoroughly and diligently prosecuted against the said Earl. (Enq. p. 136.)

His Majesty, in another Letter writ the same Day by Secretary Nicholas, declares in Effect,

That the Warrant, whereby Glamorgan pretended to be authorized to treat with the Roman Catholics in Ireland, was an arrant Forgery;

That it was neither sealed with the Signet, as it pretended, nor attested by either of his Majesty's Secretaries;

That it was written in a Style very different from that, in which Writs used to be writ;

do what he had done; he being bound up by his Majesty's positive Commands from doing any Thing, but what the Duke of Ormond should particularly and precisely direct him to, both in the Matter and Manner of his Negotiation.

The Duke knowing this, tells Glamorgan in a Letter, dated Feb. 11, 1645, that he might securely go on in the Way he had proposed to himself to serve the King, without Fear of Interruption from him, &c.

The Duke is here so far from approving of his Conduct, or intimating that he had an Authority for what he did, that the Words are a severe Rebuke of his Conduct; they plainly imply, that Glamorgan had behaved in such an indiscreet and unwarrantable Manner, that his Grace would give himself no further Trouble about him.

The subsequent Paragraph in the same Letter is a clear Proof, that this is the true Sense of the Words before us. *Your Lordship may go on securely for me in your own Ways; you may do as you think proper. My Commission is to treat with his Majesty's confederate Catholic Subjects here for a Peace, upon Conditions of Honour, and Assistance to him, and of Advantage to them; which accordingly I shall pursue to the best of my Skill; but shall not venture upon any Negotiations foreign to the Powers I have received.* Plainly intimating, that Glamorgan's Negotiations were unauthorized; that he had acted *foreign to any Powers which he had received.*

That

That *it was surreptitiously gotten, if not worse*; that his Majesty remembered it not;

That it was a *very strange Warrant, &c.* that *several Circumstances shewed the Author of it, to have no very good Meaning* — and I am sure, says Secretary *Nicholas* (such Practices) *are not fair Dealing.*

The King resented *Glamorgan's* Behaviour in so high a Manner, that whereas he had intended to confer upon him the Honour of an Earldom, he immediately ordered, that the *Patent* should be stopped. *The King, says Secretary Nicholas, hath commanded me to advertize your Lordship, that the Patent for making the said Lord Herbert of Ragland, Earl of Glamorgan, is not passed the Great Seal; so that he is no Peer of this Kingdom.*

Having thus given, from authentic Records, some Account of the King's Behaviour towards *Glamorgan*, let us,

2dly, In the next Place see, how the Duke of *Ormond* behaved towards him, after he was arrested at *Dublin*.

And here again, I shall appeal to Evidence produced by the Enquirer himself, he having given us a Letter from the Duke of *Ormond* to *Glamorgan*, and some other Particulars, not altogether foreign to our Purpose.

The Duke of *Ormond's* Behaviour towards this Nobleman, appears to have been very different from what his Grace's pretended Letter to Lord *Muskery* represents it to have been.

In the *Duke's Letter to Glamorgan*, dated
October

October 6, 1646, there are these Words—I am so great a Reverencer of the King's AUTHORITY, and so desirous to advance his SERVICE, that if your Lordship will let me see the ONE, and instruct me in the Ways of the OTHER, you will find from me ready Obedience to his Power. Now the Duke, before this, had seen Glamorgan's pretended Warrant. When therefore he says, If your Lordship will let me see the King's Authority for what you do, does not his Grace plainly signify to his Lordship, that he looked upon the pretended Warrant, which Glamorgan had shewn him, to be no Authority at all; nothing but a Power, which he himself had forged? And accordingly he rebukes him in the following genteel Manner. "I must take the Freedom of a better Subject, than most your Lordship meets with there, and of one that wishes you Happiness, to advise you to be careful, how you affirm, your Desires to serve the King to be Powers from him. So, my Lord, I rest your Lordship's affectionate Kinsman, &c. Ormond."

From Lord Digby's Letter to the Duke of Ormond (dated the 18th of the same Month) it likewise plainly appears, that his Grace looked upon Glamorgan's pretended Powers, to be spurious, and no Powers at all. *There is nothing more certain, says Lord Digby, than that the Lord Glamorgan is a principal Author and Fomentor of all this Mischief of the Clergy, and that he hath forged NEW POWERS from his Ma-*

jestly to take upon him the Command at least of Munster; if not of Ireland.

But with what Propriety could his Lordship say, when he was writing to his *Grace*, that *Glamorgan* had forged NEW POWERS, if his *Grace* had not looked upon the pretended Powers and Warrants which *Glamorgan* had shewn him, to have been Forgeries?

Upon the whole, I think, it is clear, that neither the King nor the Duke of *Ormond* had so very favourable an Opinion of *Glamorgan*, as the *Enquirer* would make us believe. I shall therefore proceed to an Examination of the Letters above-mentioned, and see whether they can possibly be reconciled with the Account, which is here given of his Majesty's, and the Duke of *Ormond's* Behaviour towards *Glamorgan*. If it shall appear, that they are utterly irreconcilable, and that the *said Letters* have plain Marks of Forgery, I think there will be no Difficulty to determine, what Credit is due to them, when confronted by the most *authentic Records*.

It is a Rule generally admitted, that no Credit is due to such Writings as Letters, till the *Originals* are produced, and they are found able to stand the Test of an Examination. Now the *Compiler* of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, who has given us these Letters, and upon whose Credit the *Enquirer* has recommended them as *genuine*, it is certain, never saw any of the *Originals*.

It is further evident from the Letters themselves, that the Design of them was chiefly to recommend *Glamorgan* to the *Nuncio's* good
Graces,

Graces, by representing him as a much greater Man than he really was. This was evidently the Design of all his Forgeries, all his spurious Pieces. How a Scheme, which was so apparently calculated to gratify his Vanity, which seemed to promote the extravagant Projects, for which, he fancied, he was destined by Heaven, I think, *Glamorgan* would find no great Difficulty to engage in. Writing or forging an hundred Letters, would, by a Man of his unhappy Turn of Mind, be deemed a trifling Offence, where he had such romantic Schemes in View.

Upon the Strength of such Motives, he actually drew up, or gave Directions for drawing up, several Letters and Powers of a forged Nature. His Warrants and Patents, as will be shewn immediately, were of this Sort; and the Letter to the *Nuncio*, which has been examined already, is manifestly such; which is at least a presumptive Argument, that he would not scruple to forge others.

The *Letter* of *August* 11, 1645, said to be written by the Duke of *Ormond* to Lord *Muskery*, is liable to great Exceptions. It is dated from *Dublin*; and yet there is not a Letter of his *Grace's* amongst the great Number, which he was careful to preserve, that is dated in this Manner. They are all dated * from *Dublin Castle* or his *Majesty's Castle in Dublin*.

In the same Letter, the *Duke* recommends

* See the Originals in the Custody of Mr. *Carte's* Executrix.

to Lord Muskery, Glamorgan as a Man in great Favour and Authority with his Majesty. *I know no Subject in England, says he, upon whose Favour and Authority with his Majesty, and (upon whose) real and innate Nobility, you can better rely.*

The Words (*Upon whose Authority with his Majesty, and real and innate Nobility, you can better rely*) are perfectly agreeable to the Style and Character of Glamorgan; to his excessive Vanity, to his enthusiastic Turn of Mind; but are utterly inconsistent with the Duke of Ormond's Way of Writing, or with the Knowledge he had of Glamorgan. The Duke of Ormond was remarkably civil and obliging to his Friends; but seldom paid them Compliments at the Expence of Truth. He knew, that Glamorgan was a Person unfit to be intrusted with the Management of Affairs. His Majesty had plainly signified as much to him in a Letter, dated December 27, 1644. As to Glamorgan's Judgment, says he, *I will not answer for it.* The Duke knew for certain from the same Letter, that Glamorgan had no Commission to transact Affairs in Ireland, without his Grace's Consent and Directions. And yet in a Letter of a subsequent Date (*viz. August 11, 1645*) his Grace is said to have recommended GLAMORGAN as a *Man in such high Favour and Authority with his Majesty, that he knew no Subject in England upon whom he [Lord Muskery] could better rely.*

That the above Letter is not a genuine one,

that it was never writ by the Duke of *Ormond*, may be presumed from several historical Circumstances, which I shall beg Leave to mention, they being such as may not be disagreeable to the curious Reader. It is upon the sole Credit of the Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, that the *Enquirer* has given us this Letter as *genuine*; and yet the Compiler, as was said before, never saw the Original; and there is great Reason to doubt of his Exactness, in relating Matters, such at least as happened before the *Nuncio's* Arrival in *Ireland* *.

Commissioners, says this Writer, *had been sent on July 12, from Kilkenny to Dublin, to treat of Peace, and Glamorgan was present at the Conferences, but nothing was concluded.*

Here the Compiler is mistaken in almost every Particular. The *Treaty* began at *Dublin* † in the Middle of *June*, the Commission of the *Irish* Deputies bearing Date *June 13*; and the first Paper in the *Treaty* was presented on the 19th of that Month by the *Irish* Commissioners to the *Lord Lieutenant*. The *Treaty* was constantly carried on from that Day to the End of *July*, by Means of the like Papers; the Proposals and Answers being both made in Writing, without any Conference at all, except on *July 22*; when there being a Debate, the Duke of *Ormond* hath taken Care ‡ to mention all the Persons present on his own Side, as well as

* The *Nuncio* landed in the Bay of *Killmair*, *Oct. 22*, 1645. † *Memoirs*, p. 53, 96. ‡ *Ibid.* 177.

that of the *Irish*; and it appears thence, that *Glamorgan* was not present.

The last Papers delivered, were given on *August* 5, to Lord *Muskery* and the other Commissioners, who set out that Day for *Kilkenny*; but that *several Things* were granted and concluded in this Treaty, is evident from the Duke of *Ormond's* Recapitulation thereof, in a Letter of *August* the 7th * to the Lord *Muskery* and the Commissioners.

As for the Letter in Question, there is no Copy of it among the Duke of *Ormond's* Letters, tho' there are a good Number of *his* and the Lord *Muskery's*, to one another, in this very Month of *August*; nor doth *Muskery*, in any of his Letters, take the least Notice of any such Letter wrote to him in *Glamorgan's* Favour, or so much as mention the Name of this Nobleman.

It must be observed further, that the Letter in Question was framed, so as to be a Sort of Credential for *Glamorgan*, and sent to *Muskery* and the other Commissioners. Now the Duke of *Ormond* kept Copies of all Letters on public Affairs, that were to be communicated to others, as about this very Time, in a Letter † on *August* 20, he expressly tells Lord *Muskery*.

In short, *Glamorgan* does not appear to have held any Correspondence with the Duke of *Ormond*, till after he had made his clandestine Treaty with the *Irish*; when he began to brag ‡ of the Pains he had taken for bringing them to

* *Memoirs*, p. 230. † *Ib.* 287, 298. ‡ *Ib.* 308, 313.
a right

a right Temper for a Peace, and to a fixed Resolution of sending Supplies to *England*. He then acquainted the *Lord Lieutenant* *, that the whole *Assembly* had consented to send over 10,000 of their best Men, well armed and clad; that the Commissioners were setting out for *Dublin* to finish the Treaty upon such Conditions, as his Excellency had agreed, or was empowered to grant; and that the rest of their Petitions would be referred to his Majesty's Pleasure, that the Supplies might not be delayed. This was the Plan of Proceedings, which *Glamorgan* had settled with the *Irish* in his private Treaty.

That the Duke of *Ormond* was an utter Stranger to what *Glamorgan* had transacted in this Affair, is clear from *Glamorgan's* own Confession at *Dublin*, after he was arrested. Upon his Examination before a Committee of the Board, consisting of the Earl of *Roscommon*, the Lord *Lambert*, and Sir *James Ware*, his Lordship confessed, that he had consulted with no body in the Affair, but the Parties with whom he made the Agreement.

This is further evident from *Glamorgan's* Letter of the 4th of *September*. He was conscious that the King had given him strict Orders to do nothing without the Intervention and Directions of the *Lord Lieutenant*; that his Majesty had only desired him verbally to accelerate the Peace, and use his Interest with his Friends in *Ireland* for that Purpose. *Glamorgan* therefore having acted such an unauthorized Part,

* *Memoirs*, p. 351, 360, 361.

ventures to write to the *Lord Lieutenant*, wherein he seems to try, whether he could not get some Kind of Countenance from his Grace for what he had done. But as Guilt often betrays itself, in the very Letter in which he endeavours to obtain the Countenance of the Lord Lieutenant, he in Effect owns, that he had never consulted his Grace in any Thing he had done. After he had actually concluded a Peace with the *Irish*, without the Privy or Directions of his Grace, he was not ashamed to profess, that *he would not act without his Commands in the least Circumstance*; but the Way being chalked out by him, *he should never think he could err*; plainly intimating, that no Way had hitherto been chalked out to him; that he had never received the least Instructions from his Grace, with regard to the Affair which he had been transacting.

And indeed the Duke was so far from minding any Thing which he wrote or undertook, that he doth not seem to have answered his Letters, as he did every other Person's, that wrote upon Business, till he was sent for to *Dublin*, where he was arrested for negotiating a Peace with the *Irish*, and pretending to the King's Authority for that Purpose.

Let us now apply these Remarks to the Letter in Question. Here then we have a Letter imposed upon us by the Enquirer as genuine, which has all the Marks of Forgery imaginable.

It is dated from *Dublin* in a different Manner

ner from what the Duke of Ormond always dated his Letters;

It recommends *Glamorgan* to the Lord *Muskery* in such a Style, as is utterly inconsistent with that of his Grace's usual Way of writing, and with the Knowledge he had of *Glamorgan*.

It is given us as genuine upon the sole Credit of the *Compiler* of the *Memoirs*, who never saw the Original, and who appears to have been very incorrect in his Account of Matters, about the Time, when the Letter is supposed to have been writ.

It is not to be found amongst the Duke of Ormond's Letters, tho' we are assured, that he carefully kept Copies of all those that were writ on public Affairs, and which were to be communicated to others; and lastly, to omit other Circumstances,

Lord *Muskery* takes not the least Notice of any such Letter wrote to him in Favour of *Glamorgan*, nor ever mentions the Name of this Nobleman in any of his Letters, tho' several passed between the Duke of Ormond and his Lordship in the very Month of *August*, when the Letter in Question is dated.

But to proceed. *Glamorgan's* unfair Practices being now discovered, he is sent for to *Dublin*, arrested and imprisoned on Suspicion of High Treason, of forging Powers from the King, and negotiating a Peace with the *Irish*. A Charge of such a high and heinous Nature, one would think, should have deterred him from venturing a second Time upon Practices, which
so

so nearly affected his Life and Fortune. But his Releasement, after he had been charged with so heinous a Forgery, is, in the Opinion of the Enquirer, a much more surprising Circumstance. From this Circumstance, the Enquirer has suggested a most invidious Insinuation in Prejudice to his Majesty. He has insinuated, that *the Earl was still on good Terms of Confidence with the King, notwithstanding his Majesty pretended to disavow his Proceedings, and ordered him to be prosecuted.* (Enq. p. 117.)

“ It is extremely surprising, says he, that the
 “ Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland
 “ should release the Earl from his Confinement,
 “ before they received any Answer from the
 “ King to their Letters, in which they represented so strongly, what Prejudice the *Earl's*
 “ treating with the *Irish* Rebels in the King's
 “ Name, had done to his Majesty's Reputation.
 “ And it is highly probable, that they would
 “ not have suffered his Lordship to depart, after he had been charged with so heinous a
 “ Forgery, *if he had not satisfied them, by producing to the Lord Lieutenant a Warrant of*
 “ *January the 12th, and perhaps by other Means,*
 “ *that he had Authority from the King to act*
 “ *as he had done in the Treaty of August 25,*
 “ *1645.*” (Enq. p. 277.) But if it shall appear,

That the Exigencies of Affairs (not the Reasons here suggested by the Enquirer) made it necessary, that *Glamorgan* should be released ;

That several Circumstances contributed to
 flatter

flatter him in his unparalleled Presumption, and to put him upon his old Practices ; and which is more material,

That the Letters and Warrants, which the Enquirer has given us for *genuine*, are real Forgeries, then I presume, the *Enquirer's* Insinuations, that *Glamorgan had the King's Authority for what he did*, will be deemed by all impartial Readers to be *idle, groundless Conjectures*. I shall therefore give a short historical Account of Affairs, subsequent to *Glamorgan's* Imprisonment, and make a few Remarks upon them.

The Charge for which *Glamorgan* was arrested and confined, I own freely ought to have brought him to his Senses ; but there were several Circumstances attending it, which contributed to flatter him in his unparalleled Presumption. When the News of his Imprisonment reached *Kilkenny*, every body cried out for War, and were for laying Siege to *Dublin* immediately, which was in a very ill Condition for Defence, and the reducing whereof would have been the Ruin of all the Protestant Interest in *Ireland*. The General Assembly then sitting, demanded *Glamorgan's* Liberty with an high Hand, protesting, that they would treat no more of Peace till he was released ; that they would not send the 3000 Men designed for the Relief of *Chester*, who lay ready to embark, but should not stir, till he that was named their General, and who had undertaken to provide them shipping, was set at Liberty. In these Circumstances what could the Duke
of

of *Ormond* and Council of *Ireland* do, but take the Step insisted on? Without which, far from expecting the 10,000 Men proposed to re-establish the King's Affairs in *England* and *Scotland*, they could not hope for a smaller Body, that might have served to relieve *Chester*, the only Place left in *England* which could keep open a Communication with *Ireland*.

All the loyal Protestants in and about *Dublin* would have been exposed to inevitable Destruction, had the War been renewed. In this distressed Situation, *Glamorgan* was released, upon giving 40,000 *l.* Bail for his Appearance after thirty Days Notice; an Obligation which gave him no small Uneasiness. Upon this Indulgence he promised mighty Matters, and went to *Kilkenny* to engage the Assembly, which had interested itself so warmly in his Behalf to dispatch the 3000 Men for the Relief of *Chester*. I can't find, that he was ever employ'd in any Thing else; this too had been promised before, and the Performance stopped by his Imprisonment. The Men were ready at the Water-side, and yet it failed, purely by his not providing the Transports for which he had undertaken.

The Commissioners indeed came to renew the Treaty of Peace, pursuant to the Promise of the Council of *Kilkenny*, when they solicited for his Release; but the 3000 *l.* demanded upon the Peace, for the Subsistence of the Protestant Army under the Lord Lieutenant, which was ready to disband and starve for Want, was not paid, till the Peace was concluded; when

when Lord *Muskery* * and the *Irish* Commissioners engaged for the Payment.

The Distresses and Calamities under which the Protestant Army in *Ireland* laboured at the Time when *Glamorgan* was released, were extremely great. The Forces were in no Capacity to renew or carry on the War. *Glamorgan* himself was sensible of it; and sometime before his Imprisonment had offered the Duke of *Ormond* a Bill of his own for 2500 *l.* †, in Part of the 3000 *l.* which the Council of *Kilkenny* had promised to advance upon the Conclusion of a Peace. But his Grace civilly declined accepting it, knowing well how unable he was to make good his Offer. He had before pretended ‡ to have 15,000 *l.* Credit at *Kilkenny*, which he would employ for the King's Service, and for providing Ships, Arms, and Ammunition for the *English* Expedition. He had wrote Word, that he had Shipping ready to transport 6000 Foot with some Horse to *England*; and yet when Lord *Digby* and *Daniel O Neile* came in the Beginning of *April* to *Waterford* ||, in order to embark for *France* on Board one of his Vessels, they might have waited there long enough had they not met unexpectedly with two other Frigates. It was about this Time that Lord *Digby* found *Glamorgan* in the melancholy Mood he represents him; and herein he agrees with the Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, fol. 1102, who gives

* R. 13. † Q. 399, 415. ‡ Q. 261, 372. R. 101.
|| Duke of *Ormond's* Life, Vol. III. p. 456, 459.

an Account of a Letter of *Glamorgan's* to *F. Robert Nugent*, wherein he expresses himself weary of Life, by reason of the Disappointments which had attended all his Undertakings. To this the King's Declaration against his Proceedings and the Articles of his Agreement, did not a little contribute.

Glamorgan had been used to teaze the Duke of *Ormond* with Letters full of Professions of Zeal for his Service; he had frequently desired to receive his Commands; but the Duke would never give him any, and *Glamorgan* was so conscious of his Misbehaviour, and so sunk upon the Discovery of his Negotiation with the *Irish*, that he did not trouble his Grace with a Letter for three Months together. He did not write to the Duke till Lord *Digby's* Return from *France*, when a small Matter served to raise his Spirits and put him upon his former Practices. Mr. *Walsingham* had been sent from *England* with the King's and Secretaries Dispatches of *March 26*, and *April 3*, 1646, and arrived with them on *May 25* at *Dublin*, as appears by the Duke of *Ormond's* Endorsement of the Time of their Receipt on the Back of those Letters; in which he says, they were brought him by Mr. *Walsingham* Lord *Digby's* Servant *. Mr. *Walsingham* was obliged

* A Mistake of the Compiler of the *Nuncio's* Memoirs will not improperly be taken Notice of in this Place: This Writer, speaking of Mr. *Walsingham*, calls him both Lord *Digby's* and Lord *Glamorgan's* Servant; upon what Pretence or by what Mistake, I cannot imagine. Two such Services were incompatible, and tho' he might perhaps in the ordinary unmeaning

to go for *Ireland* to wait upon his Lord, who set out from *France* and landed at *Waterford* *July* the 1st; and in this Journey he chanced to meet with *Glamorgan*, and gave him some Account of the King's Good-Nature in suspending the Execution of any Sentence that might have been given against him at *Dublin*.

Glamorgan's Conduct was considerably alleviated by the *Defeasance*, which declared, that

Way of Compliment, style himself *Glamorgan's* humble Servant, there is not the least Foundation to think him so in any other Sense. He was Under-Secretary to Lord Digby, and admitted to an honorary Degree of A. M. or L. L. B. at *Oxford*, on March 18. 1643-4 (*A. Wood's Fasti. Oxon.* p. 35) and there resided, doing the Duty of his Post, till Lord Digby leaving the Court in the Beginning of *April* 1646, and going into the North, he was sent to *Ireland* with the Dispatches above-mentioned. As he had been before, so we find him after this Time constantly in Lord Digby's Service as one of his Secretaries, following his Fortune, and employed in his Affairs; never in *Glamorgan's* by whom those *Memoirs* pretend falsely that he had been sent to *Oxford*.

There is as little Truth in the Assertion, that the Duke of Ormond kept *Walsingham* at *Dublin* two Months to prevent his delivering a Letter from the King to *Glamorgan*. For upon Supposition there had been any such Letter, he had daily Opportunities of sending from *Dublin* to *Kilkenny*, by the Expresses which went continually between those Places; the *Irish Commissioners* being all that Time settling some of the Articles of the Peace at *Dublin*. But it is certain, that *Walsingham* had no Letter for *Glamorgan*, but only a verbal Message. He staid at *Dublin* upon his own Affairs. He had, as a Reward for his Services, obtained from the King (*R.* 51, 346, 347) a Warrant, dated *April* 6, and signed by Secretary *Nicholas*, for the Creation of two Persons (to be named by him, with the Approbation of the Lord Lieutenant) to the Dignity of Barons. Upon this Business he staid at *Dublin*, in order to find out and treat with proper Persons, inclined to purchase those Honours: One of which I find was bought by *Thomas Furlie* of *Knockiough*, on *June* 28; and Sir *Nicholas White* was, on *Walsingham's* leaving *Dublin*, empowered to treat with a fit Person for the other.

nothing

nothing in the Articles of his Agreement with the *Irish*, should at all oblige the King, unless he should approve thereof. Mr *Walsingham* telling *Glamorgan* that this Circumstance was considered in a favourable Light, and that the King imputed his Conduct rather to a misguided Zeal than to any Malice, this put *Glamorgan* upon forging the Letter from the King, dated *April 5, 1646*, in order to recover his Credit with the Nuncio, who sent a Copy of it on *July 7*, to Cardinal *Pamfilio*. The *Enquirer*, p. 343, quotes Sir *Richard Coxe* for fixing the Date of this Letter to *July 8*, but thinks him mistaken as to the Date; whereas he was full as much mistaken about the Substance of it, having in all Appearance never seen the Letter in Question.

Walsingham had in Civility and Complaisance to the Earl represented the King's and the Duke of *Ormond's* Sentiments of him in a favourable Light, and *Glamorgan*, whose natural Temper made him exaggerate every Thing in his Behalf, and magnify a civil or compassionate Expression into an Act of the highest Confidence and Friendship, wrote a Letter to the Lord Lieutenant upon the Occasion, and sent it by a Servant of his own to *Dublin*. I am apt to think Sir *Richard Coxe* might have seen this Letter, and thence took those Assurances of Favour and Friendship, which he mentions. It bore no Date, but it appears from the Endorsement, that it was received on *July 18*, by the Duke of *Ormond*.

In this Letter, *Glamorgan*, agreeable to his usual ambiguous Way of writing, speaks of *Assurances* he had received of the King's constant Favour and Friendship, which he imputes to the good Offices of the Lord Lieutenant. He acknowledges that the King's Favour towards him was owing to his Excellency's noble and favourable Relations of him to the King, who had intimated especially, that he had laid his Commands on his Excellency to afford him his particular Favour. He speaks likewise of Mr. *Walsingham's* assuring him of his Excellency's constant Remembrance of him, which he had never doubted; and depending on his Favour, desired his Commands in any Way he should prescribe.

The Duke of *Ormond* was civil to him, but would never send him any Commands, notwithstanding *Glamorgan's* repeated Desires and pompous Professions of Dependance on the King's and the Duke's Favour. The Design of these Professions was evident. They were made in Hopes of his being employ'd, and of getting up the Recognizance, which he had given when admitted to Bail. He was in Hopes that the King's Letter above quoted *, might dispose the Lord Lieutenant to release him, before he came to the Knowledge of his private Transactions with the *Nuncio*.

Every Body who reads the Terms of *Glamorgan's* Letter, received on July 18, by the Duke of *Ormond*, will see plainly, how inconsistent it is with the forged Letter, in which

* Life of Duke of *Ormond*, Vol. II. Append. No. 23.

there is not a Word of the Duke, nor of any Commands laid on him; but Glamorgan is entirely referred to Lord Digby*.

But what is still a further Proof of the Forgery is, that it appears evidently from the third of the Reasons drawn up by Glamorgan himself †, to excuse his not waiting on the Lord Lieutenant at Kilkenny, that *Walsingham brought him no Letter from the King, but was only intrusted to deliver Matters to him verbally.*

This *spurious Letter* was not sufficient for Glamorgan's Purpose. He was treating with the *Irish Clergy* as well as the *Nuncio* ‡; and the former were inclined to admit the Articles of his Peace if the Objections to their Validity could be removed. This seems to have been the Occasion of the other forged Letter, pretended to be dated on *July 20*, from *Newcastle*, though the King was then kept so close a Prisoner, that he had no Means of sending to any body, but by the Canal of the *French Ambassador*, who being allowed to visit him, transmitted his Packets for the Court of *France* to *Paris*. He was treated worse than a Prisoner, not a Person permitted about him, by whom he could either receive or transmit any Thing to or from those whom he would have to know his Mind; and in a Foresight of this Treatment, he had desired the Prince, the Queen, and all his faithful Servants, to govern themselves jointly, according to what they

* See the forged Letter, p. 84.

† S. 306.

‡ Nun. Mem. fol. 1300, &c.

should judge to be the true Interest of his Crown and Posterity.*

He was made, from the Beginning of *June*, a Prisoner of the strictest Kind; "the Scots" had set forth a Proclamation of *Death* against "any who had served him during the Troubles, that should presume to come amongst them; and his Majesty declared, he had no Possibility left him, either of receiving any Knowledge of his own Affairs, or any Advices from his faithful Servants; much less to express unto them his Pleasure in any Way, but what they should force him; and having, with much Skill and Difficulty, obtained that secret Means of expressing in short his sad Condition and Will thereupon, the Queen, the Prince, and his faithful Ministers, were to understand it as the last free Direction they could expect from him." These are the Words of Lord *Digby*, in his Letters of *June* 17, and *July* 4; and yet sixteen Days after, the Framers of the Letter of *July* 20, makes the King assert the contrary, and find a Way of conveying a Letter to *Glamorgan*. But it is observable, that neither the *Nuncio's Memoirs* nor *Vittorio Siri* (who had probably seen the Copy sent to *Rome*) mention the least Word of the Manner how, or of the Person by whom, it was sent.

It is certain, the King could find no Way of sending to the Duke of *Ormond* for six Months after that Time; nor did his Grace,

* Life of the D. of *Ormond*, Vol. III. p. 477, 478, 488.

or any of the Council of *Ireland*, ever receive a Line from him, till the Middle of *January* 164⁴₇; when he try'd, by the Means of *John Makeray* *, a *Scotsman*, to set on Foot a Correspondence. Whether in such a Situation the King could get a Letter convey'd to *Glamorgan*, let the Reader judge. As to the Style of the Letter, after what has been already said of his Majesty's Way of writing, I shall offer nothing at present; but leave the intelligent World to consider, whether such a Letter could possibly be writ by one of the finest Pens that the Age produced.

The short Account which is here given of the distressed State of the Protestant Army in *Ireland*, of the Behaviour of *Glamorgan*, of his Releasement, and of the Letters which are pretended to have been writ by King *Charles*, I presume will need no Apology; the Account being faithfully taken and transcribed from the best and most authentic Records. I shall only beg Leave therefore to make a Remark or two upon the several Particulars above-mentioned.

Here then it is observable, that the Releasement of *Glamorgan* was not, because the Lord Lieutenant believed, *that he had the King's Authority for what he did* (as the Enquirer has insinuated) his Grace having in Effect declared that he believed the contrary; that he looked upon his pretended Powers to be no Powers at all, but arrant Forgeries. *Be careful, says he, how you affirm your Desires to serve the*

* U. 86, 90.

King, to be Powers from him. (See Enquiry, p. 259.)

That the true Reasons, which made his Releasement necessary, were the Difficulties and Emergencies of Affairs in *Ireland* ;

That no sooner did the News of his Imprisonment reach *Kilkenny*, but every Body cry'd up for War, and were for besieging *Dublin*, which was in a very ill Condition for Defence ;

That the Reduction of it must have been attended with the utter Ruin of the Protestant Interest in *Ireland* ;

That the General Assembly demanded *Glamorgan's* Releasement with an high Hand, and protested, that they would treat no more of Peace till he was released ;

That they would not send the 3000 Men for the Relief of *Chester* upon any other Condition. And whereas it may seem surprizing, that a Man, who was charged with so heinous a Forgery, should again venture upon his old Practices, it must be remembered,

That *Glamorgan* had still the same unhappy Turn of Mind for romantic Projects, the same Zeal for Popery, the same Connexion with the *Jesuits* as ever ;

That several Circumstances at this Conjunction contributed to flatter his Vanity and put him upon his old Practices ;

That the General Assembly did, what, I dare say, he looked upon as a great Honour, that they demanded his Releasement with a high Hand ;

That Mr. *Walsingham* signified to him, that the King had spoke favourably of him; that he had imputed his Conduct to a misguided Zeal rather than to any Malice;

That he had ordered the Execution of the Sentence, which might have been passed upon him at *Dublin*, to be suspended.

These are Circumstances, which could not fail to affect a Man of *Glamorgan's* Turn of Mind, who was too apt to exaggerate and interpret every civil and kind Expression to his Advantage. But what is more material, the Letters, which the Enquirer hath given us for genuine, appear to be manifest Forgeries. As to the Letter supposed to have been writ by the Duke of *Ormond* to Lord *Muskery*, dated *August 11, 1645*, it is evidently such; it having every Mark of Forgery that is usually found in Writings which are confessedly of a spurious Nature.

Another Letter, said to be writ by the King to *Glamorgan*, the Enquirer mentions in the following Manner. *We find one Letter of his Majesty's*, says he, *to him* [*Glamorgan*] *of the 5th of April 1646, tho' his Lordship did not receive it till July following; Mr. Walsingham who had Orders to deliver it into his Lordship's own Hands, having been detained above two Months at Dublin by the Marquis of Ormond.*

To this he adds the following Note, Mr. *Coxe* [*Sir Richard Coxe*] tells us, *that on the 8th of July 1646, his Majesty, by Mr. Walsingham, sent the Earl of Glamorgan a most kind*
and

and gracious Letter, containing great Assurances both of Favour and Friendship. But he [Sir Richard] seems to be mistaken in the Date of that Letter. (Enq. Note in p. 243.)

What the *Enquirer* means by this Note is difficult to guess. As he has hinted that Sir Richard Coxe was mistaken in the Date of that Letter, it is reasonable to conclude, that the *Enquirer* would make his Readers believe, that the Letter which Sir Richard mentions, was the Letter under Consideration. If so, I need only refer the Reader to what has been observed already, it having been clearly proved, that it could not possibly be the Letter in Question.

But whether the *Enquirer* means or would insinuate, that the Letter, which Sir Richard Coxe mentions, was the Letter in Question or not, it is clear, that the Letter in Question must be a Forgery; *Glamorgan* himself, as was said before, in one of the Excuses, which he made for not waiting upon the Lord Lieutenant at *Kilkenny*, having expressly signified, that *Walsingham* brought him no Letter from the King, but only a verbal Message.

But what is still more extraordinary, the *Enquirer* knew, that the Contents of this Letter were absolutely inconsistent with the most public and solemn Declarations of his Majesty. But these Declarations had no Weight with the *Enquirer*. A spurious Letter, and his own fruitful Imagination, were more to be regarded than the most solemn Declarations of a Prince, who, we are assured, from Writers of all Denomina-

tions, was a Prince of great Integrity, of eminent Virtue and Piety.

It is not pretended by the *Enquirer* himself, that this Letter was delivered to *Glamorgan* till above two Months after the Date of it: And how does he account for this Difficulty? Why, he tells us, that *Walsingham* was detained during that Time at Dublin by the Marquis of Ormond. Base, groundless Suggestion! evidently calculated to support a most shocking Falshood! it being certain from what has been observed already, that *Walsingham* brought no Letter to *Glamorgan* from the King; and upon Supposition he had brought him one, it is equally certain, that he had Opportunities every Day of sending from *Dublin* to *Kilkenny* by the Expresses which went between those Places, the Commissioners being all that Time settling the Articles of Peace at *Dublin*.

That the other Letter, dated July 20, from *Newcastle*, was a Forgery, is likewise evident. The Situation in which the King then was, made it extremely difficult, if not impossible for him, to get a Letter convey'd to *Glamorgan*; it being notorious, that he was then a Prisoner with the *Scots* under the strictest Confinement, and that he neither did, nor could write a Letter to the Queen, the Prince, the Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*, or any one Friend upon Earth for several Months.

Having considered the Letters which the *Enquirer* has given us for *genuine*, and shewn them to be very different from what they are represented

sented to be, I shall now proceed to examine the *Warrants* by which *Glamorgan* negotiated Affairs in *Ireland*, and the *Patent* creating him Earl of *Glamorgan*. If it shall appear that they are all *Forgeries*, I presume I shall be strictly justified in pointing to the idle and absurd Nature of the *Enquirer's* conjectural Calumnies and unparalleled Insults upon the Memory of a Prince, who little deserved such Usage from a Member of our Church, or indeed from any one, who hath the least Regard for the present Establishment.

As I have not the Vanity or Ambition to ascribe to myself what is not my own, I beg Leave to declare, that some of the foregoing, and most of the following Observations, relating to *Glamorgan's* pretended *Warrants*, *Powers* and *Patents*, were communicated to me by the late Mr. *Carte*. Mr. *Carte* having favoured me with a Correspondence for many Years, I take a sensible Pleasure in making this public Declaration, and doing Justice to the Memory of that learned Historian. And if in a very few Pages he shall appear to be Master of a more judicious Insight into the Nature and Customs of our Constitution, Master of more true Learning, more critical Skill in historical Knowledge, than is to be met with in the Writings of all the *Enquirers*, all the Essay Writers, all the virulent Libellers of King *Charles*, that this Age has produced, I doubt not but the learned Reader will give him a fair hearing, at least not be so prejudiced against him as to prefer idle Conjectures

jectures to authentic Facts, or superficial, illiterate Glosses, to Truths, which are supported by Evidence, little less than Demonstration.

Glamorgan in all Probability left *Oxford* as early as the Beginning of *January* 1643, he having in the Interim between the Beginning of this Month and the latter End of *April* following, raised two Regiments in *Monmouth-shire* and *South-Wales*, which could not well have been done in less Time than is here assigned for that Purpose. Accordingly two of his pretended Warrants bear Date, one on the 6th of *January* 1643, and the other on the 12th of the same Month. This probably was a Contrivance of the Person who fram'd them, that their Dates might be made to tally with the Time when *Glamorgan* departed from Court. But why the King should grant him two Warrants in one Month, and at a Time when the Peace with the Irish was supposed to be concluded, are Circumstances, which I fancy the Enquirer will find some Difficulty to account for.

It is certain, that the Lord *Brabazon*, Sir *H. Tichburne*, and Sir *James Ware* (who had been sent by the Lord Lieutenant and Council to give an Account of the State of the Treaty with the Irish) had set out from *Oxford* at *Christmas*, on their Return to *Ireland*, with Instructions, which made the Court very confident of the Peace being concluded upon their Arrival at *Dublin*. The King, in his Letter of *January* the 4th, to the Duke of *Ormond* (see his

his Life, Vol. II. *Append.* p. 6. No. xiv.) says, that he did not doubt of the Peace, and therefore desires him to press the *Irish* for their speedy Assistance, in which Case they were to land a Body of Forces about *Cumberland*, for aiding the Royalists, as well in the North of *England*, as in *Scotland*; and his Protestant Troops in *Ireland* were to land at the same Time in *Wales*, and to provide Shipping from *Dunkirk* and the *Irish* Ports, to transport them before the End of *March*; after which Time, as the Rebels were Masters of the Seas, the King observes, it would be exceeding difficult to transport a Body of Forces from *Ireland* to *England*. The Court continued in this Opinion of the Certainty of a Peace, till after the Battle of *Nasely*, nay till *June 27*, 1645, when Lord *Digby* asserts it in his Dispatch of that Day to the Lord Lieutenant *. What Occasion then could there be for either of *Glamorgan's* pretended Powers of *Monday February 6*, or *Sunday January 12*; the first two Days, and the last eight Days after the King's Letter?

It was natural enough, as was said before, for his Majesty, when *Glamorgan* was going on his private Affairs to *Ireland*, and was suppos'd to have a considerable Interest with the *Roman Catholics* of that Country, to recommend to him verbally the employing of his good Offices for accelerating the Peace and the Succours, in such a Manner, as he should be directed by the Lord Lieutenant, to whom he

* See Vol. III. p. 417. No. 397, 399.

wrote by him to that Effect; but there was no manner of Occasion for empowering him to treat and make Articles for a Peace, which was thought to be settled; much less would a Man be employed in such a delicate Affair, upon *whose Judgment*, the King told the Duke of Ormond in that very Letter, *there was no Dependence*.

When the Marquis of *Antrim*, a Man much of the same Turn of Mind with *Glamorgan*, was employ'd in 1644 to procure Succours for *Montrose*; he was not only instructed to do nothing without the Lord Lieutenant's Directions *, but *Daniel O Neile* was sent with him to take Care he did not deviate from his Instructions.

When Colonel *Fitzwilliams*, a wiser Man than either of them, went over afterwards to *Ireland*, on his undertaking to bring thence a Body of the *Irish Forces* to the King's Assistance†, he was only referr'd to the Duke of Ormond, to be employ'd in such manner as his Excellency should think proper. The King had too much Regard for the Duke of Ormond, to take any Step, that might seem to intrench on his Province; and as it was his usual Method in all Cases, to refer Undertakers to the Duke's Judgment, to act in Subordination to his Authority, there is no Colour of Reason for his proceeding otherwise in the Case of *Glamorgan*.

* Life of Duke of Ormond, Vol. III. p. 235. No. 233.

† ibid. p. 416. No. 397. Vol. II. App. p. 10. No. 20.

It was thought of *Arthur Trevor* (see his Letter of *April 9, 1645*) and by others of the Court, that this Nobleman might be of some Use for hastening the Peace, and Succours, under the Lord Lieutenant's Management, agreeable to the King's Letter of *December 27, 1644*; but it seems very plain, that *Glamorgan* had no Commission, and consequently no Instructions but what were verbal. *Glamorgan* himself never pretended to have any written Instructions: and as for the Powers, which he thought fit to forge and produce to the *Nuncio* and the Council of *Kilkenny*, they were undeniably illegal, and consequently of no Use, but to impose on a Stranger, or on Persons willing to be deceiv'd.

Scarampe, the Pope's Agent, employ'd in Ireland till the *Nuncio's* Arrival, in his Letter of *September 1, 1645*, to Cardinal *Pamfilio**, speaking of *Glamorgan's* Articles of Peace, which he sent inclosed, says, " that they stood
 " only on the sorry Foundation of this Lord's
 " Promises, who own'd that his Powers were
 " illegal, as being signed only by the King and
 " *his Secretary*, and sealed with the little Seal; " meaning the *Sign Manual*. But even here *Scarampe* was mistaken in one Particular: For the Compiler of the *Nuncio's Memoirs* observes afterwards, that *Scarampe* (a Stranger, unacquainted with the Usages of *England*) was mistaken in the *Signature*; none of *Glamorgan's* pretended Powers, being either *countersigned*,

* *Nuncio's* Mem. f. 908.

and attested by the Secretary, or passed under the Signet.

It must be observed further on this Occasion, that no Orders or Warrants signed by a King of England, and only under his Sign Manual, without the Attestation of a Secretary of State, are of any Validity; of which I have seen, says Mr. Carte, a remarkable Proof in a famous Order, shewed me by the late Sir W. Gifford, and Dr. George Clarke, signed at the Bottom by R. William; but when the Admiral Herbert, Lord Torrington, had refused to act under it, signed again by the same Prince at the Top, and by the Earl of Nottingham at the Bottom. King Charles, when Lord Digby was made Secretary, had settled an Order*, that nothing should pass, nor be imputed as a Grant from him, that was not attested by one of his Secretaries, or in Martial Affairs by the Secretary of a Council of War; a Rule which the Lord Lieutenant was on February 8, 1643, desired to observe, in case any thing should be brought him under the King's Hand unsubscribed. This Regulation was constantly observed, not only in Matters of greater Moment, but even in Warrants † for creating Baronets, with Blanks for the Name of the Person, to be filled up by the Lord Lieutenant, and for granting Licences to come to England.

Glamorgan was perhaps ignorant of this Rule and Usage, or supposed others to be ignorant

* Life of the Duke of Ormond Vol. III. p. 242. No. 232.

† No. 254, 255, 263.

thereof;

thereof; when he framed that extraordinary Warrant, which is dated *January 12, 1644*, and recited at length in p. 20, 21. of the Enquiry. It is really amazing that any Man of *common Sense*, can lay the least Strefs on a Warrant, which carries in it all the Marks of Forgery; yet the Enquirer hath thought fit to make a Pother about it in several Places, particularly in p. 107, 8, where, by an enormous Blunder, he hath been pleased to attack Mr. *Carte*, on the Subject of this Warrant *.

* After the Enquirer's malicious and injurious Treatment of King *Charles*, I have the less Reason, says Mr. *Carte*, to repine at his Usage of me; but I should choose he would put any Body's Blunders upon me, rather than his own. I can't forbear taking Notice of the Mistake, which he charges upon me in a Note at the Bottom of the Pages 107 and 108 of the Enquiry. He says there, that Mr. *Carte* has evidently confounded the two Warrants of *January 12*, and *March 12*, the latter of which was sent over with the Letter of the Council of Ireland on *January 5*, whereas the former was not produced by the Earl till *January 6*. — And what then? Does it it follow from hence that Mr. *Carte* was wrong, in saying (Vol. I. p. 554) that the Lord Lieutenant sent a Copy of the Warrant of *January 12* to the King, and that his Majesty remembered nothing of a Warrant, which, if he had ever signed, it was too remarkable to be forgot? Was not the Space of twenty-four Days, which passed between the 7th and 31st of *January*, Time enough for the King to receive from *Dublin* a Copy of the Warrant in Question?

I have Reason to think, that no Copy of the Warrant of *March 12*, was sent to the King in any other Manner, than as recited in the Articles of *Glamorgan's* Treaty; but in what Manner soever it was sent, it cannot be thence inferred, that the other of *January 12* was not sent likewise; it being certain that it was, and that the Messenger arrived with it at *Oxford* on *January 24*, as will appear immediately.

It is observable, that his Majesty, in his Letter of *January 29* to the Parliament, complains of *Glamorgan's* framing, or forging (not one, but) several Papers and Writings, either out of Falseness, Presumption, or Folly. But the Enquirer adds, that the King's Letter of *January 31, 1645-6*, which Mr. *Carte* ap-

It

It was produced on *January 6, 1645-6*, to the Duke of *Ormond*, who finding it of so extraordinary a Nature, and way of penning, desired Leave to transcribe it; which he did immediately, with Intent to transmit it to his

plies to the last mentioned Warrant, relates to that of *March 12*; as likewise the Letters of Secretary *Nicholas* of the same Date to the Council of *Ireland*, and to the Lord Lieutenant.——And what is the Enquirer's Reasons for it? Why, such a one as will prove that two and two make five, as well as four. In the Warrant of *March 12*, are these Words. *As firmly as under the Great Seal of England*. In the Warrant of *January 12*, are Words to the same Effect. This Warrant was to be made good to all Intents and Purposes, as effectually, as if it had been under the Great Seal of England. Now Secretary *Nicholas*, in his Letter to the Lord Lieutenant and Council of *Ireland*, cites the Words in the former Patent, and not the Words in the latter; i. e. he makes use of the Word *firmly* instead of *effectually*; and from hence the Enquirer concludes, that he speaks of the former Warrant, and not of the latter. But what is the real Difference between the Words *firmly* and *effectually*? Why, none at all. They differ only in Sound, not in Sense; they differ in short just as much as two and two differ from four; and yet from hence the Enquirer infers, by a peculiar Logic of his own, that Secretary *Nicholas's* Letter relates to the Warrant of *March 12*, and not to that of *January 12*. Thus has our great Critic, like some eminent minute Philosopher, employed his Time in whipping a Snail, and to much the same important Purpose; the Philosopher, to shew what Lengths the Reptile can go, how far he can travel; and the Enquirer, what and how much he can write in a Day, to serve the Cause of Nonsense, Falshood, and Forgery. It must be a strange Eagerness in a Person for blackening the Character of the Royal Martyr, and finding Fault with those, who offer to do Justice to his Memory, that could tempt a Man to lay such a Stress upon a Difference, between Words where there is really none, and to draw a Consequence from a paultry Criticism, which is utterly inconsistent with Historical Facts. Whether this is impartially considering Mr. *Carte's* Account of *Glamorgan's* Affair, or his Use of the Nuncio *Renucini's* Memoirs, the Reader must judge.

The King's and Secretary *Nicholas's* Letters are evidently applicable to both Warrants, and plainly relate to both. But that the Secretary's related more particularly to that of *January* the Majesty;

Majesty; and the next Day received another Copy of it from *Glamorgan*, wrote with his own Hand, and attested as a true Copy. These two Copies, says Mr. *Carte*, I have now by me. And that the Duke sent a Copy of this Warrant in a Letter on *January 19*, to the King, by Colonel *Butler*; and that this is the Warrant, to which the Letters of Sir *Edward Nicholas* of *January 31* more particularly relate, appears from the Original Papers†, which I am ready to shew any Body, that desires Satisfaction on this Head.

This therefore, as well as the Warrant of *March 12th*, were both disowned by the King, and charged by both the Secretaries as Forgeries, in the Letters Numb. ccccxviii, ccccxv. ccccxvi. ccccxvii. in the Third Volume of the Duke of *Ormond's* Life.

As to the *first* of them, there was hardly ever seen such a Warrant upon Earth, if we consider either the Style in which it runs, so

12th, is beyond Dispute. From the Duke of *Ormond's* Papers and Letters (amongst which are found two Copies of this very Warrant) it appears, that this was the Warrant, of which a Copy was sent the King by Colonel *Butler*; that he arrived with it at *Oxford* on *January 24*, and consequently that the Mistake which the Enquirer would shift off upon Mr. *Carte*, is entirely his own. Here the Enquirer seems to resemble an unfortunate Gentleman, who, when he chanced to be offensive in Company, would endeavour by a dextrous Enquiry, to fix the Indecency upon his Neighbour; apprehensive that the Company would in all Probability smell the Joke; he was used to ask his Neighbour, Pray, Sir, have not you done something amiss? Whether I have or not, says he, I can't say. I am sure you have; for you sink egregiously.

† Papers marked Q. 265. 251. 253.

different from all other Forms, or the extravagant Powers, which it was proposed to convey. The Gallantry ascribed to *Glamorgan*, in not standing upon nice Terms to do the King Service, is so much of a piece with the Words of his Letter to the Lord Lieutenant on *January 7*, when he sent him the attested Copy of this *Warrant*, viz. "That if he was not
 "nipped in the Bud, he hoped to produce
 "such a Blossom of Loyalty and Zeal for his
 "Master's Service, as should render his Memo-
 "ry considerable to future Ages," that it could not well come from any other Pen. No Mortal that had less Vanity of Heart, or fewer romantic Schemes in his Head, than *Glamorgan*, could ever have thought of engaging the King, to make good all that he should do, in Virtue of any Warrant under the *Sign-manual*, or *Pocket Signet*, or *private Mark*, or even by Word of Mouth, as effectually, as if his Authority had been under the Great Seal of *England*, and to confirm every Thing he should do, though neither warranted by Law, or in the King's Power to authorize. This Warrant, it seems, was calculated to authorize what it could not warrant; and a Man that is capable of imagining, that the King could either draw, or sign such a one, is fit to believe all the Absurdities and Contradictions in Nature.

It hath been already observed, that there was no Occasion on *January 12*, for granting even an ordinary Commission to *Glamorgan*; what Reason then could there be for one so extravagant;

gant; especially since this could answer no other purpose, than to gratify the Vanity of the Man who framed it? For whilst it seemed to grant him every Thing, it granted him nothing in Reality, and did not so much as empower him to treat with the *Roman Catholics of Ireland*. It was probably this Defect, that made him frame the *other Warrant of March 12*, which empowers him to treat, and conclude with them, and is drawn in more modest Terms; but was disavowed, as well as the other, by the *King*, and both the *Secretaries*.

It is very plain, that, from the Date of this pretended Power, there was no manner of Correspondence, by *Letters* or *Messengers*, between either the *King* or his *Secretaries*, and *Glamorgan*. This *last* never sent the *others* any Account of his Proceedings, nor did *any of them* so much as enquire after him, or mention his Name in any Dispatch to *Ireland*, till he was arrested, which was near ten Months afterwards. Had *Glamorgan* been intrusted with a Commission to negotiate the Affairs in *Ireland*, this Silence is unaccountable.

But what proves undeniably the *Forgery* of both these *Writings*, of *January 12*, and *March 12*, is,

1. That they both attest, in their own Behalf, that they are *sealed with the Signet*, and yet there was *no Signet* to either.

2. That they are both directed to *Edward Earl of Glamorgan*, a *Title*, or rather a *Name*, which he had assumed to himself without any

Right. For though a *Sign-Manual* had been sent to the Secretary's Office, in order to a Precept, directing "*an effectual Grant to be made to him by Letters Patent under the Great Seal,*" (such are the Terms of Warrants in the like Cases) of the Title of *Earl of Glamorgan*, and the Privileges thereto belonging; yet it had stopped there. No effectual Grant of that Title had been made, and no Patent had been issued, by which alone it could be conferred. Nor was any ever issued afterwards; for which Reason, his Son *Henry*, the first Duke of *Beaufort*, did not pretend to the Title; nor is it mentioned either in the Inscription on his Tomb, nor over his Stall at *Windsor*, among his other Titles. (See *Sandford*, p. 364, 366.)

As for *Glamorgan's* Commissions under the *Great Seal*, though he shewed them to the *Nuncio*, yet they seem at that Time to have been a Secret to all the World besides; and could not be convicted of *Forgery*, whilst they remained unknown. The *first* of these is mentioned no where, but in the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, fol. 713; and the Compiler's Copy of it is the only Rule upon which we can form a Judgment thereof. It gives him Power *to levy Troops, without any Stint of Number, in Ireland, and Parts beyond Sea, as well as in England; to command them, and appoint his Officers; to order all civil, as well as military Affairs, in those Countries; to pardon all that submitted, and to dispose of all Delinquents Estates, where-ever he was Master of the Field,*
at

at his Pleasure; to put in and remove Officers and Governors of Places; to gather and make use of all the King's Rents, Customs, and Revenues, to support his Forces; all military Officers whatever being enjoined to obey him as their GENERALISSIMO; the Title, Pre-eminences, and Emoluments of which Dignity were given him; and all other Officers, of what Rank and Condition, ordered to observe and honour him, as the Man of the King's special Trust and Confidence.

The second Patent is recited in the Enquiry (from p. 22. to 26.) from Collin, who printed it in his *Peerage of England*, Vol. I. p. 72, 73. and probably transcribed it from a Copy taken by the late learned Mr. Anstis, whom he used to visit, and who, being a very obliging, communicative Man, would easily allow him that Liberty. If Mr. Collins had it from Mr. Anstis, I dare say, he would not omit to let him know that it was forged; though, perhaps, he did not care to mention the Person from whom he had it.

In reading *this Patent*, a Stranger would be tempted to think, there was not a Man of Capacity in *England* but *Glamorgan*, and that he was capable of every Thing; "for he is made
" *Generalissimo* of no less than three Armies (an
" *English*, an *Irish*, and a *foreign* one) and Ad-
" miral of a Fleet at Sea, with Power to re-
" commend a Lieutenant-General to the King;
" to name of himself all inferior Officers, and
" to give them his Commissions. For enabling
" him to support the Charges, and to discharge

“ the Functions of this Employment, he was
 “ empowered, as well to contract for Ward-
 “ ships, Customs, Woods, and all the Rights
 “ and Prerogatives of the Crown, as to give
 “ Copies of this Commission under his Hand
 “ and Seal; and is said to have been intrusted
 “ with several Patents under the *Great Seal* of
 “ *England*, from a Marquis to a Baronet, with
 “ Power to dispose of them without knowing
 “ the *King's* further Pleasure. For his own
 “ Encouragement, the King is said to promise
 “ his Daughter *Elizabeth* to his Son *Planta-*
 “ *genet* in Marriage, with 300,000*l.* for her
 “ Portion, and the Title of Duke of *Somerſet*
 “ to him and his Heirs-male for ever. He is
 “ likewise allowed to give the Garter to his
 “ Arms, and to put on the *George* and *Blue*
 “ *Ribbon* at his Pleasure; and for his greater
 “ Honour, and in Testimony of the King's Re-
 “ gard for him, his Majesty is said to affix with
 “ his own Hands the *Great Seal* to this Com-
 “ mission.” The *Nuncio's Memoirs*, fol. 1004.
 add, “ that *Glamorgan* had likewise the Power
 “ of naming *one Secretary* of State, *one Trea-*
 “ *surer*, *two of the Privy-Council* of *England*,
 “ and either the *Attorney* or *Sollicitor Ge-*
 “ *neral*.”

A Man must be either very weak in his Judg-
 ment, or very strong in his Passions, who doth
 not, at the first Sight, pronounce these Patents
 to be spurious; and the *Enquirer* could not take
 a more effectual Way to convince the World of
 his surprizing Capacity, or something that I
 choose

choose not to name, than by recommending them to his Reader for *genuine*. Can a Person of common Sense really think, that Powers of of such a Nature and Extent should be trusted to any Subject, especially to such a Man as *Glamorgan*, of whose Judgment the King had so justly a Diffidence?

Glamorgan had taken it in his Head, to get the Post of Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*; and because the Duke of *Ormond* had been empowered to apply all the Revenues of the Crown in that Country towards the Maintenance of the Army under him, and allowed to dispose of two Earldoms to Persons, who were already either Barons or Viscounts, and to grant Pardons to repenting Rebels; this seems to have been the Reason why he framed the like Powers to himself in a greater Latitude, to out-vie his Rival in Trusts, in Power, in Honours, and Titles, and to persuade the *Nuncio*, that he was more in their Master's Favour.

The last Clause in the latter Patent speaks of the King's putting the Great Seal to it with his own Hands, as a distinguishing Mark of that Favour; but it was probably inserted to obviate an Objection that might be made to the Patent, and which is of itself sufficient to prove it forged. The Lord Chancellor *Littleton* had then the keeping of the Great Seal, and continued in that Office till his Death on *August 2, 1645*. He was too honest a Man to put the Great Seal to such a Patent, and too religious an Observer of the Forms and Duties of his Office, to suffer

the King to put it, without entering a Memorandum of it upon Record. If any Man will please to look into *Rymer's Fadera*, he will see an infinite Number of such Memorandums (on Occasion of our Kings going abroad, the Change of a Keeper, and the like) relating to the *Great Seal*. He will observe the scrupulous Exactness with which it was taken out of a Box or Purse for a Moment to seal Writs, &c. and with which it was put again into the Box or Purse, and sealed up; the minutest Circumstances not being omitted, and the Ceremony always performed in the Presence of Men of Quality, or Members of the King's Council. But there is no Memorandum upon Record of King *Charles I.* ever taking the *Great Seal* into his Hands, and putting it to the Patent in Question, or to any other; nor is there any Entry of either of these Patents in the Chancery, or in any other Office, through which they must previously have passed. If this Nobleman had so short a Way of coming at the *Great Seal*, why did he not get a Patent passed to create him Earl of *Glamorgan*? It would have saved him, as well from making himself ridiculous, by assuming a Title to which he had no Right, as from running the Hazard of vitiating and annulling those very Patents, and all others (to which he pretended) by a *Misnomer* of the Person to whom they are said to be granted. Why did he not get the Powers, in Virtue whereof he took upon him to treat and conclude with the *Irish*, passed under the *Great Seal*, when

Sca-

Scarampe, when the *Nuncio*, when the *Assembly* of the Clergy at *Waterford**, objected to them as illegal without it, and when *Glamorgan* himself was, upon the King's disavowing them, obliged to own the Force of the Objection †, and that he himself was become useless?

Both these Patents are directed to him, by the Style of Earl of *Glamorgan*, to which are added in the *former*, the Titles of Lord *Herbert*, and Baron of *Beaufort* and *Grismond*; and in the *latter*, those of Lord *Herbert*, Baron *Beaufort* of *Caldicote*, *Grismond*, *Chapstow*, *Ragland*, and *Gower*, Baronies actually vested in his Father, and neither conveyed, nor capable of being conveyed to another. They are dated, the *former* on *January* 6, in the Twentieth of King *Charles's* Reign, in the Year of our Lord 1645; the *latter* on *April* 1, in the Twentieth of King *Charles*, in the Year of our Lord 1644. This King came to the Crown on *March* 27, 1625; so that the *latter Patent*, dated *April* 1, 1644, is dated earlier, in Point of Time, than the *other*; though the blundering Framer of *both*, considering only the Course of Months in the Year, or more used, as a *Romish* Priest, to the *Roman* Style, than to that of the Church of *England*, or perhaps ignorant of the exact Time of the King's Accession to the Throne, and fancying it happened in *April*, designed no doubt to have the Patent of *January* 6, be

* *Nuncio's Memairs*, fol. 1300, 1301. † *Ib.* 1101.

thought

thought prior to the *latter*. This Design appears plainly from the additional Titles in that of *April 1*, (*Glamorgan* not being of an Humour to drop any which he had once assumed) from the larger Powers granted in it; from the greater Honours said to be promised him, and the more important Trusts pretended to be reposed in him.

Besides, what Pretence had he to any of those Powers, &c. on *April 1*, 1644, when there was no Occasion for his Service, or the Trusts said to be placed in him, or for his being *Generalissimo* of an *Irish* Army, as well as of one of *Foreigners*, and another of *English*; when there were no Thoughts of his going to *Ireland*; much less of employing him there, he not having formed the Design of going thither till about the *Christmas* following?

It may be asked likewise, For *what* End these Patents were passed, and what Use they served, since he never exercised any of the Powers or Trusts, nor enjoy'd any of the Honours or Advantages contained therein? And as for the pretended Promise of a Marriage between the Princess *Elizabeth* and his Son *Plantagenet*, it never took Effect; nor doth ever appear to have been moved, or the Thoughts of it to have entered into any Body's Head but his own; And as to the Name of *Plantagenet*, that he gives his Son, it is well known, that he never had but one Son, whose name was *Henry*, a Nobleman of extraordinary Merit, Virtue and Loyalty, who was on *December 2*, 1682, created Duke

Duke of *Beaufort*. There would be no End if I was to examine minutely all the unaccountable Passages in these spurious Patents.

I cannot however forbear adding on this Occasion two Observations, which may perhaps put the Enquirer upon more innocent Searches, than he hath lately dealt in; and which in the Result, though they may not contribute so much to his Preferment in this World, he will probably have less to answer for in another.

One is, that ever since the Act of 18 *Henry VI.* when any *Warrant* of the *Kings of England* is sent to the *Chancellor* for the Time being, the *Day of the Delivery* thereof to the Chancellor, hath, in Obedience to that Act, been entered on Record in Chancery, and the *Letters Patents* made upon the said *Warrant* bear Date the *very Day* of the Delivery, being otherwise declared invalid. Hence it comes, that as *Sunday* is no Day of Business, and no Office is open on it, no Warrants ever appear to have been sent and delivered to the Chancellor on that Day, and consequently no Patents have ever been dated on it; so that all Patents whatever which bear Date on a *Sunday* are justly liable to Suspicion, and ought to be deemed spurious.

The other is, that our Kings of *England* did not use in any of their Acts, to add the *Year of our Lord* to that of their Reign, unless in Treaties and Instruments, designed to be sent into foreign Parts. I have now before me, says Mr. *Carte*, a Copy of all the Patents of the Creation of all the Nobility, whether Earls,

Dukes, Marquisses, Barons and Viscounts, enrolled in the Tower from the Time of *Henry II.* to the first of *Henry VII.* and the Year of our Lord is not mentioned in any one of them. To apply the last of these Observations to the two Patents already mentioned, I observe, that the Drawer of them, not used to royal and public Instruments, but to such as pass only between private Persons, hath thought fit to put the *Year of our Lord*, besides that of the King's Reign, to both; and being confounded by the *English Method* of beginning the Year, hath fixed the Year 1645 to the pretended Patent of *January 6*; which proves to be eleven Days after *Glamorgan* had been imprisoned at *Dublin* for his presumptuous Offence in treating and concluding an Agreement with the *Irish*. It is not pretended, the King put the *Seal* with his own Hands to this Patent, so that it must have passed in the usual Forms; and yet it is not enrolled any more than the other; and when the Affair of that Nobleman's Imprisonment, and the Occasion of it, became the public Discourse of the World, was it possible (at the very Time when the Patent is said to have been passed) and when Intelligence of such a Fact would have been amply rewarded, to keep such a Patent private? And yet private it remained, till brought to Light by the *Nuncio's Memoirs*.

These Things prove sufficiently the Spuriousness of both the Patents; but the Remarks made upon these extraordinary Curiosities by the late learned Mr. *Anstis*, Garter King at Arms,

Arms, are too material to be concealed from the Public. These Patents were for some Time lodged with Mr. *Anstis* for his Inspection; and as he was one of the most learned Men that this Age hath produced, his Opinion in a Case of this Kind must, with Persons of Sense and Letters, have its due Weight. He had seen more Seals of our Kings, Nobility and other Persons, as well as Communities, both at home and abroad, than perhaps any Man upon Earth; was infinitely curious about them, and extremely exact in all his Observations, as evidently appears by the Collections he has left behind him, particularly by a Letter of his, which is now by me. The Letter was sent to the late learned M. *Clairambault*, Genealogist of the Order of the Holy Ghost. And as I was then, says Mr. *Carte*, residing at *Paris*, and had the Honour to be made the Canal of a Correspondence between them, I translated it into *French* for the Benefit of the Genealogist, who could not sufficiently admire the great Knowledge, Judgment, and curious Observations, of his valuable Correspondent.

After Mr. *Carte* returned to *England*, he made Mr. *Anstis* frequent Visits; and as they often talked of the Earl of *Glamorgan's* unaccountable Conduct, so Mr. *Anstis* as often assured him, " That all the pretended Patents
 " of that Nobleman were forged; that some
 " of them he had seen and considered with
 " great Exactness; that observing the *Matrix*
 " of the *Great Seal* in all of them to be con-
 " siderably

“ siderably thicker, than he had ever observed
 “ before, he had the Curiosity to examine one
 “ of them, and found the *Great Seal* to be
 “ formed of *two Great Seals*, clapped together,
 “ so as to inclose the Label fixed to the Patent.”

In the Year 1737, *October 3*, he shewed me, says Mr. *Carte*, two of these Patents, which he had been curious enough to copy. One of them was the same which was afterwards published by Mr. *Collins* in 1741, and is now reprinted in the *Enquiry*, p. 22, &c. The *Enquirer* imagines it to be that, which was mentioned in the House of Lords on *August 18*, 1660, and said to have been delivered up, according to the Report of Lord *Arundel of Wardour*, on the 3d of *September* following. But in this, as in most other Particulars, he happens to be mistaken; it being certain, that it is still preserved at *Badmington*, and that the Label is inclosed between two Seals clapped together.

The other, which probably never came to the *Enquirer's* Knowledge, and in which he may perhaps hope to find Matter for new Enquiries (tho' it will scarce answer his Expectation) was likewise copied by Mr. *Anstis*, and described as a very fair Patent, ornamented with the Figure of King Charles I. painted in the first Letter, and the Margins adorned with the Royal Arms and Badges; the Great Seal being affixed to it with a blackish Sort of Wax. Who was the Artist instructed in making these Ornaments is not worth an Enquiry; but some Body must have been trusted; and it happens
 very

very unluckily for this fine Patent, that it is the very same which Mr. *Anstis*, upon the nicest Examination, found to be an arrant Forgery. This, says Mr. *Anstis*, is a Copy of the very Patent which I examined so curiously, and found the Seal to be composed of two great Seals clapped together, so as to inclose the Label.

Whether the Original is now at *Badminton*, I am not certain. As both these Patents, &c. were left some Time with Mr. *Anstis* for his Inspection, they were both probably returned, and are now in the Archives amongst the Records of the Family.

This last is more in the Form of a Patent than the other; but the Style and Contents point out plainly enough *Glamorgan* to have been the Framer thereof. He is styled in it, *Edward Somerset*, alias *Plantagenet*, Knight of the Order of the Garter (which he never was) and Earl of the County of *Glamorgan*, tho' he had not been so created.

The Preamble, after deriving his Descent from *John of Gand*, and his Son *Pobn Plantagenet* Duke of *Somerset* (though this *John* never was Duke *, nor promoted to any higher Title than that of *Marquis*) and expressing his Relation to the Houses of *York* and *Lancaster*, gives a pompous Account of his military Services, whilst Lord Lieutenant or Governor of *South-Wales* and *Monmouthshire*, particularly in taking *Hereford*, *Goodrich Castle*, and the Forest of *Dene*, and in recovering the Town

* See *Sandford's* Geneal. Hist. p. 323, 324.

of *Monmouth*. This was evidently designed as a Sequel to the spurious Patent of *April 1, 1644*, in which there was a pretended Promise of creating him Duke of *Somerset*; but as if one Duchy was not sufficient for so extraordinary a Man, it creates him Duke not only of *Somerset*, but likewise of *Beaufort*; giving the Name, Rank, Style, Dignity and Honour thereof, to him and his Heirs Male (not of his Body, as other Patents usually run, but only) lawfully begotten or to be begotten, with a Seat in Parliament, and all other Rights and Privileges belonging to Dukes of *England*, and a Grant of 40 *l.* a Year out of the Customs of *Bristol*. This Nobleman lived seven Years after the Restoration, and never in all that Time either enjoy'd the said Annuity, or sat in Parliament otherwise than as Marquis of *Worcester*; nor his Son *Henry* after him, till in 1682, this last was created Duke of *Beaufort*.

The King is likewise said to invest him with these Honours, by girding him with a Sword, and putting a Cap of Honour and a golden Circle on his Head, Ceremonies used in *Ducal Creations*, when the Persons created Dukes are present, and mentioned in their Patents, when they are actually invested in that Manner; but not, if otherwise. This we see very remarkably in the Case of *Lionel of Antwerp*, *John of Gand*, and *Edmond of Hartfield*, Sons of *Edward III.* who in the Parliament of the 36th Year of his Reign, created the first Duke of *Clarence*, the second Duke of *Lancaster*,
and

and the third, Earl of *Cambridge* *. The *two last* being present, were actually invested in the usual Manner, and it is accordingly mentioned in the Patents of their Creation; but the *first* being at that Time in *Ireland*, was neither invested in that Manner, nor is it mentioned in his Patent of Creation.

It was proper to make this Observation before I mention Mr. *Anstis's* about the Date of this spurious Patent; in which the Framer, having probably some Copy of a like Patent before him, hath not mentioned the Year of our Lord, but dated it only on *May* the 4th, in the 20th Year of the King's Reign, *anno regni nostri vigesimo*. This was evidently designed for a Sequel of the Patent dated *April* 1, 1644, in the 20th of the King's Reign, and accordingly was at first dated in the same Year of the Reign. But as the Coiner of these Patents seems to have mistaken *April* for the Month of the King's Accession, he, upon Recollection, thought fit afterwards to alter the Date to the *twenty-first* Year of the King's Reign, by adding the Word *primo* after *vigesimo*.

Now this Patent, as well as the former, plainly relates to *Glamorgan's* Voyage to *Ireland*, as appears from a Passage in the Preamble †, which

* Rot. Parl. 36. E. 3. n. 35. Rot. Cart. 36. E. 3. n. 9, 8, 6.

† Et unius regni finibus non contentus in ultimas trans oceanum oras per medios hostes, & naufragia tendit, ut propriis suis impensis, omnibus spretis periculis, & opum jacturis, labanti Regis sui imperio, subsidium peteret.

represents him as ready to set out for a Country, which agrees to the Description of that Island; whereas if the Patent was dated *May 4, 1644*, his Voyage thither was not so much as thought of; and if he had been invested at that Time, it could not possibly have remained a Secret.

If it was dated on the same Day, 1645, this was six Weeks after he was gone for *Ireland*; and Mr. *Anstis* thought, that in such a Case, the Expression would not have been *tendit* but *tendit*, to represent him not as going, but as actually gone; to which I may add, that since he was gone, it was impossible for him to receive the *Investiture* mentioned in this *Patent*.

But on what Occasion, or by whom soever this Alteration of the Date was made, Mr. *Anstis* observed, that the Word *primo* was manifestly written in a *different Ink* from the next immediately preceding Word *vigesimo*, and *from all the rest of the Patent*.

I shall only mention one Particular more, enough having been said already to shew that the above Patents were arrant Forgeries. It is not an easy Matter to correct the original Blunders of a Forger of Writings, without falling into some other. Thus with Regard to the Patent in Question, the Year 1644 being Leap-Year, and *May* the 4th falling that Year (which was the 20th of King *Charles*) on a *Saturday*, when the Date was altered to the 21st of that King (1645) *May* the 4th fell on a *Sunday*, a Day secluded from all Law Business, and on which no Office was open, no Warrant could

be entered in Chancery, and consequently no Patent could be passed.

Glamorgan's pretended Letters, Warrants, Patents, being, I presume, clearly proved to be Forgeries, I might justly be excused from taking any further Notice of the idle Conjectures and invidious Insinuations, which are scattered up and down the *Enquiry* in Prejudice to King *Charles*. However as the Author hath valued himself upon his Performance, and publicly defy'd Mr. *Carte* to answer it, I shall beg the Reader's Patience a Moment.

1. Whilst I lay before him some of those little *Artifices*, by which our great Critic has endeavoured to impose upon his Readers.

2. I shall offer a Word or two in Vindication of the late Mr. *Carte*, and submit it to the Judgment of the Learned, whether it be not a shocking Piece of Presumption in a Person of the *Enquirer's* Education, to attack and load with illiterate Aspersions, a Man so vastly his Superior, not only in the very Branch of Learning (by which the Enquirer has got some Reputation) but in every Qualification, which constitute the Character of a Scholar.

3. In order to guard the sincere Members of our Church against the mischievous Designs of the Enquiry, I shall for once venture upon some Conjectures, and see whether I can't discover with what View this notable Performance was writ, and whether such a Libel upon King *Charles* can possibly be reconciled with the Reputation of a Member of that Church, for which the

said pious and protestant Prince died a Martyr.

First then, It is observable, that the Enquirer in numerous Places takes a deal of Pains to make his Readers believe, that King *Charles* secretly countenanced and encouraged the Earl of *Glamorgan* in his Negotiations in *Ireland*. And what has he offered in Support of this Suggestion? Why, several Particulars of such an extraordinary Nature, as are seldom to be met with.

He tells us, " That though King *Charles* in
 " the most solemn Manner declared, that he
 " knew nothing of the Earl's Proceedings, till
 " he was arrested; though he absolutely disa-
 " vowed him therein, and assured the Parlia-
 " ment, that *Glamorgan* had impertinently
 " framed of his own Head, those Articles of
 " Peace, which he negotiated with the *Irish*
 " Catholics, &c. yet *Vittorio Siri* observes,
 " That the King thundered against the Earl in
 " this Declaration, only in Appearance, that he
 " might be thought not to have been privy to
 " the Concessions made by the Earl in his Name
 " to the *Irish Catholics*." (Enq. p. 121.)

And who was this *Vittorio Siri*, and from whence had he his Intelligence? Why, he was Histriographer to the King of *France*; one of those People called Papists, who, as the Enquirer assures us, are at all times ready to distress the Protestant Cause, by every Method they can contrive; who, says he, are ready upon all Occasions to excite or heighten the public Confusions, by fomenting Rebellion at one
 2
 Time,

Time, and courting and exalting the Prerogative at another, as best suits their main Design of establishing the most absolute Tyranny over the Conscience and Reason of Mankind. (Enq. Pref. p. 8.)

And why might not this have been the Design of *Vittorio Siri*? As King *Charles* died a *Martyr* for the reformed Religion, why might not *Vittorio Siri* have published the Substance of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, in order to expose our Protestant Martyr, and make him ridiculous?

The *Roman Catholics* from abroad, it is certain, took all imaginable Pains to promote and keep up a Spirit of Faction in *Scotland*; and Cardinal *Richlieu*, we are assured, sent over several *Jesuits*, who preached in Puritan Dresses, and stirred up the People to Rebellion *.

Now that a Protestant Divine, a Divine of the Church of *England*, should urge the Evidence of such Men, in Prejudice to a pious, protestant Prince, is something surprizing, and naturally puts People upon enquiring, *who this Protestant Divine was.*

The Author of those infamous and deistical Observations upon the Bishop of *London's* excellent Letter to his Clergy upon the Earthquake in 1750, I think personated and subscribed himself a Quaker: But, if I am rightly informed, upon strict Enquiry he was found to

* See *Echard*, Book ii. Ch. 5. p. 661, 662 — 475 — See *Carte's* Collection of Letters, Vol. I. p. 217. — 220, 221, 222.

be a *Roman Catholic*, and Chaplain to some foreign Ambassador. But this by the Bye.

From whence had this *Vittorio Siri* his Intelligence? Why, from the *Memoirs of Rinucini*, the *Pope's Nuncio*. The Enquirer himself has signified as much. *Vittorio Siri*, says he, published in 1677, the Substance of what is contained in the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, relating to the Correspondence between the King and the Earl of Glamorgan and the Nuncio, and inserted several of his Majesty's Letters to them. (Enq. p. 317.) So that the Evidence of *Vittorio Siri* is no distinct, no independent Authority, as the Enquirer would insinuate*; but a bare Repetition or Abstract of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*. And how came the *Nuncio* to know, that *Glamorgan* had a Commission from the King? Why, *Glamorgan* told him so, and beyond all Dispute (as hath been clearly proved already) imposed upon him; it being certain, that the pretended Powers and Warrants of that Nobleman, were all Forgeries. The whole Evidence therefore of *Vittorio Siri* rests upon the Credit of an unhappy Nobleman convicted of Forgery; in Opposition, as was said before, to the most public and solemn Declarations of the King himself, to the Testimonies of both his Secretaries, to the Conduct of the Lord Lieutenant and Council of *Ireland*, who ar-

* The King's Share in the Negotiations of the Earl of *Glamorgan* will appear, says the Enquirer, but too evident, even separately from the Authority of the *Nuncio's Memoirs*. Enq. p. 272.

rested the Earl upon Suspicion of High Treason for pretending to Powers from the King, which his Majesty disavowed. But,

2dly, Sir Thomas Fairfax, it seems, intimated the very same Thing with *Vittorio Siri*. It is most clear and evident, says he, that the arresting of the Earl of Glamorgan was only for a present Colour to salve Reputation with the People, and continue their Delusion, till Designs were ripe for Execution. (Enq. p. 123.)

Who General Fairfax was, the intelligent World need not be told; nor shall I at present except to his Evidence upon Account of his Commission. The very Reasons, which he has assigned for this Charge, will clearly prove it to be groundless. His Reasons are these;

That though the King had disowned Glamorgan's Powers, yet the same Peace (which Glamorgan had negotiated) was fully concluded with the Rebels;

That the King was to have the Aid conditioned upon the same Agreement; and,

That the Earl of Glamorgan was at Liberty, and to command the Forces, i. e. the Irish Forces.

This is the Purport of General Fairfax's Charge, but as it hath been clearly proved,

That Glamorgan's Powers were all forged;

That the King knew nothing of his Proceedings;

That consequently he could never consent or agree to any Conditions, upon which the Aids were to be granted;

That Glamorgan was released for Reasons

very different from what are here maliciously insinuated, and,

That he never received any Commission from the King to command the *Irish* Forces, after he was arrested at *Dublin*; as all this has been clearly proved, what becomes of this idle Charge? If the Reasons suggested, as a Proof of it, are absolutely false, I think, the Reader will have just Reason to conclude, that the Enquirer's *faithful Deduction of Authorities and Evidences* is at best a very bad one, and not altogether so becoming the Character of a Critic and a Scholar, as might have been expected.

3dly, *Another Artifice* of the ENQUIRER consists in giving his Readers a long, tedious Detail of *Transactions, of Treaties, and Articles of Peace, negotiated by private unauthorized Persons.*

The Dexterity of the *Enquirer* in his Representation of these Affairs exceeds every thing of the Kind, and will deserve particular Attention. The *King* could not well be supposed to have treated openly with the *Pope*, and therefore Recourse is had to a more plausible Expedient. The Negotiation with his *Holiness*, we are told, was carried on in the *Queen's* Name, and by her Directions. Accordingly the Peace is sometimes called the *Queen's Peace*, and Sir Kenelm Digby is said to have been sent to Rome by the *Queen* to procure Assistance for his Majesty, and to have been intrusted with very extraordinary Powers for that Purpose. In Consequence of this, his *Holiness* is represented as
having

having a most compassionate Concern for his Majesty's distressed Circumstances, and graciously condescending to do, What? Why, to ruin him and his Protestant Subjects—graciously condescending to admit of such a Peace, such Articles, as must, if they had been comply'd with, have utterly extirpated the Reformed Religion in England and Ireland. And that the Reader might be made thoroughly sensible, that this was the dangerous Situation of our Affairs in the Reign of King *Charles*, the *Papal Articles* are display'd and laid before him.

He is further told, that the *English Roman Catholics* were in a Combination to promote the Design and carry it into Execution; that *Lord Arundel and other English Catholics residing at Paris, drew up several Articles and transmitted them to Rome, with a Request that they might be inserted in the Treaty to be made between the confederate Catholics of Ireland and the King.*

But this was not enough. For fear his Readers should be so dull, as not to see that the *King was privy to, and secretly countenanced, this horrid Design*, it is strongly insinuated, that *his Majesty* was at the Bottom of the whole;

That *Sir Kenelm Digby was empowered to promise, THAT HIS MAJESTY should in Return (for the Pope's wonderful Favours) grant favourable Terms to the Roman Catholics in Ireland and England; (Enq. p. 143.)*

That *Sir Kenelm would immediately go to the Queen in France, the King in England, and the*

the Nuncio in Ireland *, in order, as I suppose, to get the Pope's Peace ratified;

That the Pope, besides the Subsidies sent to Ireland, and those promised upon the Execution of the Articles agreed on with Sir Kenelm Digby, was so affected with the distressed Situation of his Majesty's Affairs, that he gave him [Sir Kenelm Digby] 20,000 Crowns for the Queen, without any Conditions.

That the King (who refused to ratify the Pope's Peace) repented severely, that he had not closed with the Pope's Overtures, and put himself under the Protection of the Nuncio in Ireland; and, (Enq. p. 199.)

That the Pope's Peace was afterwards resumed by the Queen, Sir Kenelm Digby, and even Lord Digby himself, with a Resolution to give the Pope and the Nuncio's Party in Ireland, full Satisfaction.

Never surely did a Critic and a Scholar exert himself in such an heroic Manner! nor will he be excused, by pretending, that he has recited not so much his own, as other People's Words and Sentiments. An Excuse of this Kind, as long as a Writer does what he can, to recommend the most injurious Falsehoods, is a stale, wretched, infamous Artifice. He who spreads a Lye, tho' his Guilt may not be equal to that of the Author of it, is to answer for its Propagation, as the first Author must for inventing it.

There is scarce a single Position in the whole, which the *Enquirer* has here advanced, but

* *Enq.* p. 153.

what is either *false* or *unfairly represented*. This will appear from Evidence, which can admit of no Exception, there being several Passages in the *Enquiry* itself and the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, which are a flat Contradiction to the Charges above-mentioned. So consistent is Truth, so inconsistent and absurd are Error and Falshood, however disguised!

How far precisely the *Queen's* Zeal for Popery, and the *Jesuits* about her, might induce her to try what she could do for his Majesty, is difficult to say. When Sir *Kenelm Digby* went for *Rome*, it is certain that his Majesty was greatly distressed for want of Money, the Revenues of the Crown being mostly seized upon, and in the Hands of the Rebels. That the *Queen* at this Time apply'd to foreign Powers to procure Assistance for the Maintenance of his Majesty's Household, and for other necessary Purposes, I believe is very true. This Suggestion is perfectly consistent with the Account which is given of the 20,000 Crowns, the Pope's Remittance to the *Queen*, it being expressly said, that it was sent to her *without any Conditions*, as a free Act of Munificence.

That Sir *Kenelm Digby* had any Powers to treat or negotiate a Peace with the Pope, either from the King or *Queen*, is utterly groundless, and destitute of every Circumstance which can give it the least Degree of Probability. When Sir *Kenelm Digby* left *Rome*, he is said to have *promised the Pope*, that he would go immediately to the *Queen* in France, to the King in England,

England, and the *Nuncio* in Ireland *. i. e. I suppose, he would communicate the *Pope's Articles* to the respective Parties, and see whether he could get them agreed to, and ratified. But it is remarkable, that upon his Return to *Paris*, he staid there several Months, without doing any thing further in the Affair, without procuring a Ratification of the Peace, or so much as going over to *Ireland*.

These Circumstances plainly imply, that he had no more Commission to treat of a Peace with the Pope, than *Glamorgan* had to treat with the *Nuncio*; and the *Pope's Articles*, which he brought with him to *Paris* were not (as will be shewn immediately) agreeable even to the Queen, she having publicly declared, that the Affair was wholly intrusted with the Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*.

When Sir *Kenelm Digby* was at *Rome* to procure pecuniary Assistance from the Pope, it was natural, that the Pope should desire him to recommend certain Articles of Peace to the Queen; and accordingly Articles were brought to her Majesty at *Paris*. But that Sir *Kenelm Digby* had any Powers to treat with the Pope is highly improbable, for the Reasons already assigned, and for others which the *Enquirer* himself, and the *Nuncio's Memoirs*, will furnish us with.

It is clear, that the Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland* knew nothing of any Power that the Queen had to transact such an Affair, and it is

* *Enq.* p. 153.

equally certain, that the Queen has, in Effect, acknowledged that she had none. The Duke in his Letter to *Glamorgan* of the 13th of *February* 1645, is expresse to the Purpose: *Nor do I at all understand*, says he, *what Ground there is for the Expectation*, your Lordship mentions of advantageous CONDITIONS by MEANS of her MAJESTY; wherein if your Lordship please to give me further Light, I shall account it an Encrease of my Obligation to your Service*.

The Queen, with Respect to this Point, has explained herself in a particular Manner.

In a Letter of Lord *Digby's* to the Duke of *Ormond*, dated *June* 17, 1646, his Lordship expresseth the great Satisfaction he had received, "since his Arrival at *Paris*, in finding, that "the Queen had been infinitely just to the "Duke of *Ormond*; and so far from entering "into any Treaty with the Pope concerning "Ireland, notwithstanding the *Nuncio's* Impudence to publish what he did at *Kilkenny*, "that she would not suffer Sir *Kenelm Digby* "to hearken to any thing on that Subject; "and her Majesty, says he, having received "some Propositions from the *Pope* concerning "Ireland, her Answer still was, that the Business of that Kingdom was already in those "Hands, that were best able to manage it, and "that whatsoever was sought for there, must "not be expected from any but your Excellence. Yea, so far went her Majesty, that

* *Eng.* p. 163.

" when

“ when the *Nuncio* of *Ireland* passed this Way,
 “ and made an Address to her Majesty, assur-
 “ ing her that he had Orders to govern him-
 “ self in the Affairs of *Ireland*, as she should
 “ direct, she would not so much as once ad-
 “ mit him to her Presence, or own him in
 “ the least Degree *.”

This last Particular is agreeable to what is
 said in the *Nuncio's* Memoirs. The *Nuncio*,
 in his Letter of July 21, 1645, from *Paris*,
 “ complains to *Cardinal Pamfilio* of the Queen's
 “ speaking in harsh Terms of the *Irish*, since
 “ the Disturbances in their Country, charging
 “ them with Rebellion, and declaring at last,
 “ that she would not own him for a *Nuncio*,
 “ because, among other Reasons, he was sent
 “ to a Pack of Rebels.”

The Evidence here produced is from the very
 best Authority, upon which the *Enquirer's* Li-
 bel is founded; from whence I think, we may
 fairly conclude, that Sir *K. Digby* had no Com-
 mission to negotiate a Peace with the *Pope*, nor
 the *Queen* any Authority to give him such a
 Power. And if any civil Messages, Compliments,
 or Proposals passed between the *Queen* and the
Nuncio, whilst the latter was at *Paris*, the
Queen had evidently no View in any of them,
 but to stop his Voyage to *Ireland*†; and they
 deserve no more Attention than the empty, in-
 sincere Profession, which the *Nuncio* made of
 his being well affected to the *King's Cause* or

* *Duke of Ormond's* Life, Vol. I. p. 565. Vol. III. p. 477.

† *Nuncio's* Mem. p. 858-9. Ibid. fol. 832, 833.

Service *, which he was sent to hinder, and used all his Endeavours to ruine.

It is not so much as pretended, nor doth there appear the least Reason to imagine, that the *King* knew any thing of what they called Sir *K. Digby's* Treaty, of the Propositions which the *English Roman Catholics* sent to *Rome*, or of the *Pope's Peace*; and since the *Queen* rejected them all, I appeal to the impartial World, whether the Artifices of the Enquirer in this Respect, can possibly be reconciled with the Character of a Critic, a Scholar, or even ——— but I forbear.

As this is the Case, it may possibly be asked, With what Design the *Enquirer* could give his Readers such a tedious idle Account of the Particulars of trifling Messages, of the Schemes of private Men, of the unauthorized and disavowed Transactions of a Person in no public Character, of the Embryo of a Peace never proposed in Form, and when heard of, absolutely rejected? To this the Answer is plain and obvious. His Design was evidently to leave upon the Minds of his Readers, an Impression highly prejudicial to his Majesty; to insinuate, that he was privy to, and secretly countenanced, not only the Transactions of *Glamorgan*, but Sir *Ken. Digby's* Treaty, the *Pope's Peace*, and most of the horrid and barbarous Practices of the *Irish* Rebels and *Roman Catholics*, at home and abroad.

The Enquirer hath expressly signified, that the King secretly countenanced the *Pope's Peace*.

* *Nuncio's* Memoirs, fol. 1020.

To this End, a bare idle Conjecture of the *Nuncio* is represented as a Position highly probable. "It is highly probable, says he, that
 " the Marquis of *Ormond* and Lord *Digby*,
 " with their Protestant Friends, represented the
 " Affair to the *King* in *England*, and *Queen* in
 " *France*, in such Light, that their Majesties
 " thought it their Interest to desist from the
 " Prosecution of the *Pope's* Peace with the
 " *Nuncio*," (*Enquiry*, p. 199.) plainly intimating, that both the *King* and the *Queen* had, in some secret Manner, approved of a Treaty of Peace with the *Pope*, and that the Persuasion of some of their Protestant Subjects was the principal Reason for their desisting from the Prosecution of it. And what has the *Enquirer* offered in support of this Conjecture? Why, such a Reason as overthrows all he had been saying, and undeniably proves the Imputation which he would fix upon his Majesty, to be false and groundless. As a Proof of this Calumny, he appeals to a *Letter* supposed to be writ by the *King* to the Earl of *Glamorgan* on the 20th of *July* following; wherein, says he, *the King appears to have repented severely* (of not prosecuting the *Pope's* Peace) *and to have wished, that he could have escaped into Ireland to the Nuncio and the Earl of Glamorgan*. But it happens unluckily for the *Enquirer* and his best Authority (the *Nuncio's* *Memoirs*) the very *Letter* here appealed to, turns out to be an ar-rant Forgery, as hath been clearly proved already. So that the Foundation, upon which
 the

the Enquirer's conjectural Calumny is here built; being removed, the Consequence is very plain; his whole conjectural Fabric must fall of Course.

However the Enquirer will have it, that there was a Treaty carried on with the Pope by the Intervention of the Queen; and that tho', to save Appearances, it was discountenanced and disowned by the Queen, yet it *was afterwards resumed by her Majesty, by Sir Kenelm Digby, and even Lord Digby himself, with a Resolution to give the Pope and the Nuncio's Party in Ireland full Satisfaction.* (Enq. p. 199.)

After what has been observed already, it would be needless to say a great deal to a Calumny, which has not the least Foundation to support it, and which in some Measure confutes itself. Sir *Kenelm Digby* was a zealous *Roman Catholic*, a Man of great Parts, of extensive Knowledge, and a peculiar Warmth of Temper. One of our Historians has intimated, that his Wit and Abilities often transported him beyond the Bounds of Virtue or Decency; that he was charged with such Acts of Vanity, and romantic Extravagances, as were scarcely consistent with that great Character which he bore in Life. How far these constitutional Infirmities, and his Zeal for Popery might carry him in the Matter under Consideration, is not easy to say, nor material to know. The only Question is (supposing him to have resumed the Treaty with the Pope) whether he had any Commission or Authority for what he did?

From the foregoing Observations it is plain, that he had neither Authority or Encouragement from the *Queen*, and that the *Queen* in Fact acknowledged, that she *herself* had none; but that the *Affairs of Ireland* were left wholly to the Management of the Lord Lieutenant of that Kingdom.

And that the *Lord Digby* should be concerned in a Treaty with the Pope, and resolve to give the *Nuncio* full Satisfaction in the Affair of Religion, is still more surprizing. This Nobleman had distinguished himself in a particular Manner; he had always expressed the highest Regard for his Majesty and the reformed Religion. About the very Time, when this Peace is supposed to have been in Agitation, he declared, and proved by undeniable Credentials, to the Satisfaction of the Council of *Dublin*, that the Duke of *Ormond* had the sole Management of Affairs in *Ireland*; "that the pretended Letter of his Majesty of *June 11, 1646*, which forbade him [the Lord Lieutenant] to proceed any further in treating with the *Irish* Rebels, was surreptitious, or forced from his Majesty; and that he took upon himself the whole Matter to answer to his Majesty, as Secretary of State with his Life, for this Declaration of his Will." (*Enq.* p. 212.)

Sometime in the Beginning of the Year 1646, the *Nuncio*, *Glamorgan*, and others, gave out that they expected Articles of Peace from the Pope, and advantageous Conditions by Means of her Majesty. This, and some other of *Gla-*

morgan's Practices Lord *Digby* was soon apprized of; and having good Reason to apprehend that that unhappy Nobleman was again fomenting Disturbances amongst the *Irish* Clergy, and forging *new Powers* to take upon himself the Command of *Munster*, it is observable, that his Lordship, in a Letter to the Duke of *Ormond*, speaks of *Glamorgan* in severe Terms. "It is necessary, says he, that the King be apprized of his Behaviour, that his Majesty no longer dally with the Fool, and that he send him some fulminating Letter, not convey'd unto him by either of us, commanding him, upon his Allegiance, forthwith to quit this Kingdom." (*Enq.* p. 260.)

Now is it conceivable, that a Nobleman, who was thus attached to his Majesty and the Duke of *Ormond*, who had such a Regard for the reformed Religion, could ever be concerned in a Treaty with the Pope, in an Interest utterly destructive of the Reformed Religion, of the Constitution in Church and State?

However let us see, what is offered in Support of this Calumny; and here the Enquirer's Reasoning will appear to be such, as I verily think never before dropt from the Pen of a Critic or a Scholar.

In order to prove that the *Pope's Treaty* was countenanced by the *King* and *Queen*, we are told, "That the *Nuncio* in 164 $\frac{1}{2}$, was still in Expectation of the Pope's Peace; for that neither the *King*, nor *Queen*, nor Sir *Kenelm Digby*, nor any Person in their Names, had

“ by Word or Writing signified to the *Pope*,
 “ to *Cardinal Pamfilio*, or the *Nuncio*, that
 “ the said Peace would not be confirmed by the
 “ *King*; and that even the contrary had been
 “ affirmed in Letters from *Paris* to *Rome*, and
 “ from both those Cities been frequently writ-
 “ ten to the *Nuncio* in *Ireland*.”

But by whom were these Letters writ from *Paris* to *Rome*, and from both those Cities to the *Nuncio* in *Ireland*? Why, undoubtedly from the *Nuncio*'s particular Friends; from those, who were privy to his Design of going over to *Ireland*; from those who were in a Combination with the *Nuncio* to distress and ruin the *King*'s Affairs in that Kingdom; who took Advantage of the Distractions there, and made use of every Artifice to hinder the Duke of *Ormond*'s Peace, and make the *Irish* believe, that Articles of Peace would soon be sent from the *Pope*. But does it follow from hence, that the *King* and *Queen* were privy to, or in the least countenanced the *Pope*'s Peace? No; both the *King* and *Queen* declared, that the Affairs of *Ireland* were wholly intrusted with the Duke of *Ormond*, and the *Queen* in particular would not suffer Sir *Kenelm Digby* to hearken to any thing upon the Subject of a Peace with the *Pope*.

But neither the *King*, nor *Queen*, says the Enquirer, nor Sir *Kenelm Digby*, nor any Person in their Names, had by Word or Writing signified to the *Pope*, to *Cardinal Pamfilio*,
 or

or the Nuncio, that the said Peace would not be confirmed by the King.

And what follows from hence? Why, the Enquirer would from hence infer, that *the King and Queen were privy to, and secretly countenanced the Pope's Peace*; i. e. Neither the King nor Queen ever signified to the Pope, to Cardinal Pamfilio, or the Nuncio, any thing about a Peace, and therefore they must have been privy to, and secretly countenanced it. Such Reasoning was never surely advanced before by a Scholar. The *Enquirer's* Business was to prove, that the King and Queen secretly countenanced the *Pope's Peace*; and how does he prove it? Why, instead of proving it, he produces Evidence from his own favourite Author, from one of his best Authorities, which proves the very reverse; which assures us, that neither the King nor Queen, nor any one in their Names, either by Word or Writing, ever signified a Syllable to the Pope, to the Cardinal, or the Nuncio, concerning a Peace.

But the *Enquirer's grand Argument* is still behind, and such a one, as I will venture to say, is not to be met with in the critical Works of any other Writer, that is extant.

In order to prove, that the *Pope's Treaty* was resumed by the Queen, by Sir Kenelm Digby, and even Lord Digby himself, with a Resolution to give the Pope and the Nuncio's Party in Ireland, full Satisfaction, we are entertained with a long tedious Story of what Sir Dudley Wyatt should tell Dennis Massari, Dean of

Fermo, and Auditor to the Nunciature, in his Way to *Rome*; which the Reader, if he has Patience, may read at his Leisure in the Enquiry. (p. 228, &c.)

I shall only take notice of a Particular or two, which more immediately relate to our present Purpose.

Here then we are told, that the *Dean* left *Ireland* the 31st of *August*, 1646, and that he landed at *Nantz*, from whence he went to *Rochelle*; that between those two Places he was accompany'd by Sir *Dudley Wyat*, the Gentleman who had been twice sent by the Queen at *Paris* to speak with the Nuncio;

That Sir *Dudley* told the *Dean*, that he was now preparing for a Voyage with Letters from her Majesty, all written with her own Hand, one to the Nuncio, another to the Marquis of *Ormond*, and a third to the Earl of *Glamorgan*, about the Affairs of *Ireland*;

That the Queen was desirous that Things might be settled absolutely to the Satisfaction of the Nuncio; or, as the Enquirer expresses it in another Place, that all possible Satisfaction should be given to the Nuncio in every thing;

That Sir *Kenelm Digby* was returned to *Rome*, to put the last Hand to that Treaty to the Pope's Satisfaction.

In my Reply to these Particulars, I shall be very short, the *Dean* of *Fermo's* Letter (the Enquirer's own Evidence) having furnished us with a full and satisfactory Answer to the whole. The Enquirer (from the Nuncio's Memoirs)

has

has artfully told us, that Sir *Dudley Wyat* was sent twice by the *Queen* at *Paris* to speak with the *Nuncio*; and from thence would fain insinuate, that the *Queen* sent him to meet the *Dean* of *Fermo* at *Nantz*, and let him know, what is above related.

As to the *Queen's* Messages by Sir *Dudley* to the *Nuncio* at *Paris*, it is certain, that they were nothing more than Compliments, and that the principal Design of her Majesty was to stop the *Nuncio* from proceeding in his Journey to *Ireland*. The *Enquirer* himself has signified as much. (*Eng. p. 34.*)

The most exceptionable Thing, which Sir *Dudley* is presumed to have said to the *Nuncio* at *Paris*, was, that the *Queen* would send to the *King* her Husband, to desire him to give her full Powers for negotiating a Peace. But as the *King* never gave her such Powers, and the *Queen* never pretended to such, but on the contrary declared, that she had none, no great Matter, I think, can be concluded from hence, either to the Disadvantage of the *King* or *Queen*.

The only Question therefore remaining is, Whether the *Queen* authorized Sir *Dudley Wyat* to meet the *Dean* of *Fermo* at *Nantz*, and to say what the *Dean* tells us he did say? If not, the *Queen*, with respect to this Particular, is at least acquitted of resuming a Peace with the *Pope*, and all the *Enquirer's* idle Account of Sir *Dudley Wyat's* Conversation with the *Dean* of *Fermo*, is so far from proving any thing in Prejudice to the *Queen*, that it plainly implies,

that Sir *Dudley* was an officious, rigid Papist, and perhaps one of those, who were in a Combination with the *Nunceo*, to distress the King's Affairs in *Ireland*.

As Sir *Dudley* met the *Dean* of *Fermo* at *Nantz*, it is plain, that he must either have been sent by the *Queen*, or else have had some Intelligence from *Ireland* of the Time when the *Dean* left that Kingdom, and set sail for *France*. Otherwise how came the *Knight* to meet the *Dean* so punctually at *Nantz*, the Place where he landed? How came Sir *Dudley* to be so exact in paying his Respects to the *Dean*, if he had not had some Intelligence from *Ireland* of the Time when the *Dean* set out for *France*?

This Circumstance, unless Sir *Dudley* was either apprized of the *Dean's* Journey by some of the *Nuncio's* Friends, or else sent by the *Queen* to meet the *Dean*, is absolutely unaccountable. If therefore it shall appear, that the *Queen* knew nothing of Sir *Dudley's* meeting the *Dean* at *Nantz*, at least, that she neither sent him nor gave him any Power to say what the *Dean* of *Fermo* tells us he did say, I think, the Story is no more a Proof that the *Queen* was any ways concerned in resuming the Treaty with the Pope, than that the King gave *Glamorgan* a Power to treat with the *Nuncio*.

Here then I shall appeal to the *Dean's* own Letter which he wrote to the *Nuncio*, wherein it plainly appears, that Sir *Dudley* had no Commission from the *Queen* to meet the *Dean*, or to
say

say what he is supposed to have said ; and that the *Dean* himself has in Effect acknowledged as much, he having expressly acquainted the *Nuncio*, that Sir *Dudley* told him nothing, as by Commission from the *Queen*, but quite the reverse ; *that what he, the Dean, got out of him, was by mere Art and Stratagem.* His Words are these : *Denique mihi dixit in omnibus satisfactum iri quoad ejus fieri potest, D.V. illustrissimæ. Hoc totum ex ipso erue Maximâ dexteritate, quare D.V. illustrissima ostendat horum se nihil prorsus didicisse.* (Enq. p. 229.)

These last Words not only prove that the *Queen* had given Sir *Dudley* no Commission, but will perhaps help us to a new Discovery. I think it is clear from hence, that the *Dean of Fermo* looked upon Sir *Dudley* in much the same Light, as most People did upon *Glamorgan*, as a bigotted Zealot, employ'd by the *Roman Catholics*, but not intrusted with any thing material.

The Words above-mentioned must either mean that Sir *Dudley* was not intrusted with the *Affairs of the King and Queen*, or else that he was a Stranger to the *real Designs of the Pope* and the *Nuncio*. If they mean that he was not intrusted with the Affairs of the *King and Queen*, it is plain, that the Charge which the *Enquirer* has endeavoured to fix upon the *Queen* is groundless, that she had given Sir *Dudley* no Commission to say any thing about the *Irish Affairs*.

If they mean that he was a Stranger to the *real Designs of the Pope* and the *Nuncio*, it is equally plain, that the *Queen* (if she knew their Designs)

Designs) had not communicated them to Sir *Dudley*, or given him any Power to treat about them. Upon either Supposition, I think, it is clear, that Sir *Dudley's* Conversation with the Dean of *Fermo*, is no Proof, that *the Queen was any ways concerned in resuming the Pope's Treaty*; it being evident that Sir *Dudley* was not acquainted with the Affair, at least not from the Queen. *Quare D. V. illustrissima ostendat bonum se nihil prorsus didicisse.* When the Enquirer puts a Construction upon these Words more serviceable to his Purpose, I will acknowledge, that he has been more lucky in an Education than some other People.

Having, I presume, fully obviated the above Charge with respect to the Queen, and Sir *Kenelm Digby*, I fancy there will be no great Difficulty in shewing, that Lord *Digby* was absolutely unconcerned either in *prosecuting or resuming* what is here called the *Pope's Peace*. I have carefully perused the Enquiry, and I can't find that the Author himself has offered a single Sentence throughout the whole, which amounts to any thing like a Proof, that his Lordship was concerned in that Affair.

It is alledged,

That *there was a great Intimacy between his Lordship and Sir Kenelm Digby*;

That *when the one was dispatched to Rome, the other was sent to Ireland*; and from these two Circumstances, the Enquirer has Recourse to his conjectural Capacity, and would insinuate,

That

That their Business was the same *, viz. to resume the Pope's Peace, and give full Satisfaction to his Holiness and the Nuncio's Party in Ireland;

That it was declared in the Council of Kilkenny, that Lord Digby, his Majesty's Secretary of State, as soon as the Peace should be proclaimed, was ready to meet the Nuncio, and satisfy him upon the Point of Religion; and that with regard to the ARTICLES to be PRESENTED by Sir Kenelm Digby to the Pope, on the Part of the Catholics of England and Ireland, his Lordship did not doubt but that his Holiness would afford the King a Subsidy of 100,000*l.* †.

And in order to give a still more plausible Colour to these Insinuations and Conjectures, it is suggested, (p. 106.)

That his Lordship, though a Great Man, was of an unconstant and capricious Temper, and that after the King's Death he went over to the Church of Rome, and died a Papist ‡.

Never surely did such a Heap of absurd, conjectural Misrepresentations drop from the Pen of a Writer, who has Pretensions to a Character; some of the above Positions being utterly inconsistent with the Account which is given of Lord Digby by the Enquirer himself.

He himself has told us, that this Nobleman opposed Glamorgan's Proceedings in such a Manner as did him great Honour ||;

That when Glamorgan gave out, that Articles of Peace were expected from the Pope, and

* Eng. p. 237. † Ib. 216. ‡ Ib. 106. || Ib. 105.

advantageous Conditions by Means of her Majesty, Lord *Digby* assured the Council at *Dublin*, that the Report was absolutely false; that the Queen would not suffer Sir *Kenelm Digby* to hearken to any thing upon the Subject of a Peace with the Pope; that the whole Management of the Affair was intrusted with the Duke of *Ormond*, and that he would answer to his Majesty with his Life for this Declaration of his Will *.

And yet notwithstanding all this, Lord *Digby* is represented by the Enquirer as *resuming the Pope's Peace, and resolved to give full Satisfaction to his Holiness and the Nuncio's Party in Ireland.*

And what are the Reasons assigned in Support of this Calumny? Why,

That his Lordship and Sir Kenelm Digby were very great †; and,

That when one was dispatched for Rome, the other was sent to Ireland ‡.

But if neither of them had any Power to treat with the Pope, or resume the Pope's Peace, if Sir *Kenelm* was forbid to hearken to any thing upon the Subject of a Peace, and his Lordship declared, that the whole Affair was intrusted with the Lord Lieutenant (all which has been clearly proved already) what becomes of this mighty Charge, or what must we think of a Writer, who has been capable of advancing a Parcel of idle Conjectures, which are confronted by the most clear and indisputable Facts?

* *Enq.* p. 212.

† *Ib.* 237.

‡ *Ib.*

But it was declared, it seems, in the Council of *Kilkenny*, that *Lord Digby*, as soon as the Peace should be proclaimed, was ready to meet the Nuncio, and satisfy him upon the Point of Religion; and that with regard to the Articles to be presented by *Sir Kenelm Digby* to the Pope, &c. his Lordship did not doubt, but that his Holiness would afford the King a Subsidy of 100,000 l.

But by whom was this Declaration made? Was it made by *Lord Digby* himself? No; but by some Popish Zealots in the Council of *Kilkenny*, who believed, or pretended to believe, that *Sir Kenelm Digby* had really a Commission to treat with the Pope, and that *Lord Digby* had said, he would meet the Nuncio and satisfy him upon the Point of Religion. Whereas it is clear, that neither his Lordship nor *Sir Kenelm* had any such Commission; his Lordship having signified by Letters and otherwise, that the Queen would not suffer *Sir Kenelm Digby* to hearken to any thing upon the Subject of a Peace, and that the whole Affair was left to the Management of the Lord Lieutenant.

Here then, I think, I may rest this Point, and leave the Reader to consider how greatly we are indebted to the critical Skill of the Enquirer for his new and wonderful Discoveries.

However, as *Lord Digby* is said to have died a Papist, it may not be amiss to offer a Word or two, which may throw some Light upon this Particular, at least prevent the mischievous Use which has of late been made of it, not only
by

by Popish Writers, but by those (I am sorry to say it) who call themselves Protestants.

That *Vittorio Siri* should endeavour to throw an Odium upon the Character of Lord *Digby*, should ascribe to disreputable Motives the Conduct of a Nobleman, who zealously opposed the Popish Measures in *Ireland*, is not surprizing; but that a Protestant Writer should attempt to fix upon his Lordship the same base Imputation; that a Member of the reformed Church established amongst us, should concur with the *Jesuit* in disparaging a Great Man, whilst he was steadily and vigorously engaged in the Preservation of our Constitution in Church and State, is what can scarce fail to put sensible People upon thinking.

The Enquirer is very positive that Lord *George Digby*, Earl of *Bristol*, died a Papist. I will have no Dispute with him, whether he did or not. I shall only endeavour to shew, that either the Enquirer knows not a great deal of the Matter, or else has represented it in such a Light, as is calculated to impose upon his Readers; and that, provided every thing he has said be true, it is very little or nothing to his Purpose.

It is alledged, That *Vittorio Siri* has ascribed Lord *Digby's* Zeal against Glamorgan's Proceedings to a less reputable Motive, than his Concern for the Protestant Religion; and in Fact, says the Enquirer, such a Concern does not appear to be the governing Principle of that Great, but inconstant and capricious Nobleman's Conduct; for tho' he had distinguished himself in 1638
and

and 1639, as a very able Advocate for Protestantism, in a Controversy by Letters with his Cousin Sir Kenelm Digby, yet after the King's Death, he reconciled himself to the Church of Rome, upon entering into the Service of France, and died in the Profession of its Faith.

So that here we have the Conduct of a worthy Nobleman, even whilst he was a zealous Protestant, impeached and condemned as the Result of an inconstant and capricious Temper, and ascribed to disreputable Motives. But was this really the Case of that noble Lord? No; on the other Hand, the Enquirer himself has told us, that he distinguished himself in 1638 and 1639, as a very able Advocate for Protestantism, in a Controversy by Letters with his Cousin Sir Kenelm Digby; and it is equally certain, that he continued a steady and sincere Member of the Church of *England* above twenty Years afterwards. But this Circumstance (in order to shew that he was an unconstant and capricious Nobleman) is artfully concealed by the Enquirer, who tells us, *that after the King's Death*, he went over to the Church of *Rome*. Now would not any one conclude, that this Nobleman went over to the Church of *Rome* upon the Death of the King? And yet it is certain, that he continued a zealous Member of the Church of *England* for many Years afterwards, as will apperr immediately. The Case was this: When Lord Digby was in *Spain*, he was teased and importuned by the *Jesuits*, on a Bed of Sickness, to die in the Bosom of what they

they called the Catholic Church ; and when his Indisposition of Body and Mind must necessarily have disabled him from vindicating the Protestant Cause with that Strength of Judgment with which he had done it, during the Time of his Health and Vigour, he was at last surprized into a Compliance with their artful Insinuations. For this Act he is represented as a Nobleman of an inconstant and capricious Temper, and his Zeal for the reformed Religion is ascribed to disreputable Motives. Such are the *ingenuous* Pains which the *Protestant Enquirer* has taken to disparage the Actions and Principles of Lord *Digby*, whilst he was an acknowledged *Protestant*.

But after all, *did not this Nobleman die a Papist?* And supposing for once, that he did, does it follow from hence, that he was not in earnest, that he was not sincere, when he was a Protestant ? Is it not barbarous and unchristian to ascribe his religious Conduct, his Zeal for the Reformed Religion, to Inconstancy, to Capriciousness, to disreputable Motives, whilst he professed and embraced Protestantism ; whilst he wrote in Defence of it, and distinguished himself as an able Advocate for it ? In a Word, to censure his Conduct at a Time, when there was not a single Action in his whole Life, which gave Mankind the least Reason to suspect his Attachment to the Reformed Religion, is base, illiterate Calumny. If a Person, who changes his religious Profession, must in any Situation, right or wrong, be guilty of Capriciousness and
 Insin-

Insincerity, the Lord have Mercy upon some People.

Whether Lord *Digby* died a Papist or not, is not the Question; his Lordship's going over to the Church of *Rome* several Years after the Death of the King, can by no Means affect the present Point in Dispute; and is very absurdly urged as a Reason, *that he did not sincerely oppose Glamorgan's Proceedings and the Pope's Peace*, during the King's Life.

The Time when this Nobleman was perverted in his Principles was in the Year 1659, in the Month of *November* or *December*, long after the Death of the King; and the Advantages which a *Spanish Jesuit* took of a violent Fever under which his Lordship laboured, were such, as would make a good Man rather pity his Misfortune, than ascribe it to Inconstancy or Capriciousness, as the Enquirer has ignorantly done. The Evidence for this Point is beyond Dispute. Lord *Digby*, in a Speech which he made and printed after the Restoration, says himself, *that he turned a Roman Catholic, not of the Court, but the Church of Rome, in a Fit of Sickneſs in Spain, when he was at Death's Door, by a sudden Impulſe.*

So that here we are incidentally told, not only *where*, but *when*, this Nobleman went over to the Church of *Rome*; it being certain, that he never was in *Spain* till the Time above-mentioned, till the Treaty of the *Pyrennees*, which was about four or five Months before the Restoration. With this, the late Bishop of *Wor-*

cester Dr. *Hough's* Account of this Matter is perfectly agreeable; and as it was transmitted to me by a very learned Friend, who had it from the Bishop's own Mouth, I choose to give it in his own Words.

‘ S I R,

August 5, 1749.

‘ I here send you what relates to the Lord
 ‘ *George Digby*, which I had from the Mouth
 ‘ of the late Dr. *Hough* Bishop of *Worcester*.
 ‘ When I was with him at *Hartlebury-Castle*,
 ‘ about the latter End of *May* 1735, among
 ‘ other Things, he told me, “ That *George*
 “ Earl of *Bristol* was perverted to Popery by
 “ this Artifice: He had always withstood the
 “ Teazings of the *Romish* Priests, who press’d
 “ him to turn *Roman* Catholic, till falling ill
 “ of a violent Fever, and the Physicians telling
 “ him his Case was desperate, and he had no-
 “ thing to think of but another World; a *Je-*
 “ *suit* came to him and pressed him, since there
 “ were no Hopes of his Recovery, to die at least
 “ in the true Church. He urged further, that
 “ if his Lordship gave them Hopes of his Con-
 “ version, God might possibly work a Miracle
 “ in his Favour, and all his Society should pray
 “ for him; and begged a Promise from him,
 “ that, if he recovered through their Prayers,
 “ he would profess himself a *Roman* Catholic.
 “ The Earl was very desirous to live, and re-
 “ covering, made good his Promise; and being
 “ ashamed to turn again, continued always in
 “ that Profession. But there is Reason to think,
 “ that

" that he never was so in his Heart ; for he was
 " not only free in declaring against the Court
 " of *Rome*, but he never had a Priest in his Fa-
 " mily after he came into *England*, nor was any
 " Priest ever known to come near him. Bishop
 " *Hough* asking his Lordship's Daughter (the
 " old Lady *Sunderland*, who was a very good
 " and deserving Lady) about it, she said, she
 " did not care to speak on that Subject ; but it
 " was always her Opinion, that her Father ne-
 " ver was really and in Opinion a *Roman Ca-*
 " tholic.

" I am, with the greatest Acknowledgments,

" Sir, your most obliged and most

" obedient Servant, &c."

Here we have the Testimony of a most wor-
 thy Protestant Prelate, who knew Lord *Digby*
 extremely well ; together with the Sentiments
 of Lady *Sunderland*, his Lordship's Daughter,
 upon the same Point. And tho' upon the whole,
 I would not venture to say positively, that his
 Lordship *did not die a Papist*, yet, I think, the
 Enquirer had much less Reason for being so
 very positive in asserting *that he did*.

Bishop *Hough*, it is plain, thought there was
 good Reason to believe, that his *Lordship's* real
 Sentiments were in Favour of the Church of
England. He admits indeed, that under a great
 Weakness of Body and Mind, his Lordship pro-
 fessed himself a *Roman Catholic*, and that he
 was really ashamed to turn again after the Re-
 storation. However, the Bishop assures us, that

after his Lordship returned into *England*, no *Romish* Priest was ever known to attend, or to come near him from the Restoration to his Death; and Lady *Sunderland* was always of Opinion, that her Father never was really a *Roman Catholic*. So that the very Fact upon which the Enquirer founds his invidious Insinuation against this Nobleman, appears at least to be a *disputable* Fact; and should we admit it to be a *real one*, it is plainly nothing to his Purpose; it being certain, that Lord *Digby* continued a zealous Protestant during the Life of the King, and that he never was perverted in his Principles, till many Years afterwards, when he was seized, as was said before, with a violent Fever, and fell into the Hands of the *Jesuits* in *Spain*.

3. Another Artifice made use of by the Enquirer, to give Credit to his Libel and depreciate the Character of King *Charles*, is such, as, I verily think, no real Friend to the Reformed Religion ever had Recourse to before. Idle hearlay Tales, groundless Insinuations, invidious Reflections advanced by bigotted Zealots of almost all Denominations, by Popish Writers and Popish Rebels, by Puritans and Independents, determined Enemies to his Majesty and the Religion he professed, are all raked together, and imposed upon the Reader, as Proofs (*separate from the Authority of the Nuncio's Memoirs*) that the King was privy to, and countenanced the Negotiations of the Earl of *Glamorgan* with the *Irish* Rebels and the Pope's *Nuncio*.

Nay,

Nay, the King himself, his Secretaries, and even Lord *Clarendon*, are produced as Evidence in this Affair, and made to speak in Favour of the Enquirer's Conjectures. His Majesty's not mentioning *Glamorgan's* Behaviour in the *Eikon Basilike*, his *Secretaries* denying their Knowledge of *Glamorgan's* pretended Warrant, and even Lord *Clarendon's* Silence with respect to his Transactions in *Ireland*, are represented as Circumstances which afford strong Suspicion that his Majesty was at the Bottom of the whole Affair, and secretly countenanced it.

“ The King himself, in his *Εικὼν Βασιλικήν*,
 “ says the *Enquirer*, is perfectly silent upon
 “ this Head, tho' it much more concerned his
 “ Character than many other Things, from
 “ which he endeavours to justify himself with
 “ the greatest Solemnity.” (*Enq.* p. 272.)

And upon Supposition the *Enquirer's* Conjectures in Prejudice to the King, had the least Foundation to support them, his Observation would deserve some little Attention. But as it appears, that *Glamorgan* had no Countenance from the King, and that his pretended Powers were all *Forgeries*, I think I need offer nothing further, in answer to a mere conjectural Charge, which rests upon a Supposition that is absolutely false.

The same may be said in Answer to the Charge against the two Secretaries of State, Lord Digby, and Sir Edward Nicholas. The Secretaries, it seems, might safely deny their Knowledge of the Warrant to the Earl of Gla-

morgan, *since the whole Transaction between the King and the Earl appears to have been a Secret between them.* (Enq. p. 274.)

But as, on the other Hand, it appears, that the Affair was not secretly transacted between them, and that the King was an utter Stranger to the Behaviour of that unhappy Nobleman in *Ireland*, what has a Writer to answer for, who has taken such artful and disingenuous Pains to fix upon his Majesty the most odious Imputation, to make him accessory to the most unjustifiable Practices imaginable?

But with regard to this Particular, our *great Critic*, if I am not mistaken, appears to be a little defective in Knowledge, at least to be more *sanguine* than *knowing*. He tells us, that *his Majesty affixed the Great Seal to Glamorgan's Patent with his own Hand, without the usual Forms, without the Interposition of the proper Officer*; (Enq. p. 274.) *i. e.* the King did something, which was impracticable; which it was not in his Power to do. But is it conceivable, that our great Critic did not know this? that he did not know, that Lord Chancellor *Littleton* had at that Time the Keeping of the Great Seal, and that his Majesty could not possibly do what is here laid to his Charge, without the Knowledge and Intervention of that great Officer?

But what has the *Enquirer* offered in Support of this blundering Charge? Why, *it is remarkable*, says he, *that Secretary Nicholas, in his Letter to the Lord Lieutenant and Council*
of

of Ireland, *speaking of the Warrant of March the 12th, bath these Words : Your Lordship cannot but judge it to surreptitiously gotten, if not worse ; for his Majesty remembers it not.*

And what does the *Enquirer* infer from hence? Why, that this Warrant was surreptitiously gotten or obtained from his Majesty. But is it possible, that Secretary *Nicholas* could mean such a Thing in a Letter, which was writ by his Majesty's Order and Direction? Is it possible, that the King would suffer his Secretary, or the Secretary presume to write any thing, which would admit of a Meaning so injurious to his Majesty's Honour, so inconsistent with the exprefs Design of the Letter, with Prudence and common Sense?

The Secretary's Letter was writ to assure the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council in *Ireland*, that his Majesty knew nothing of *Glamorgan's* pretended Warrant. *His Majesty*, says he, *remembers it not.* But the Construction, which the *Enquirer* would put upon it, supposes his Majesty and his Secretary to be void of common Sense; supposes them to admit, that if it was gotten from his Majesty, it was gotten or obtained surreptitiously, *i. e.* that it was gotten from the King and the Lord Chancellor *Littleton*, without their knowing it. I leave the impartial World to judge, whether King *Charles* or his Secretary could be capable of such absurd Nonsense.

But possibly it may be asked, What the Words, *surreptitiously gotten*, can mean? The

Meaning of the Words to any one, who has no mercenary Purposes to serve, by interpreting them to a wrong Sense, is plain and obvious. The Paragraph in the Secretary's Letter is this: *Your Lordship cannot but judge it* [Glamorgan's pretended Warrant] *to be at least surreptitiously gotten, if not worse, for his Majesty remembers it not; i. e.* Your Lordship will easily observe, that either Glamorgan has surreptitiously gotten some old Broad Seal, which he has endeavoured to make serviceable to his Purpose; or else, that he *has done worse*, that he has actually forged a new one. This Sense is no conjectural one, but the real and true Sense of the Words, it being supported by, and agreeable to Evidence, which is undeniable. The *forged Broad Seal* is still preserved at *Badminton*, as was said before, and in the Custody of a noble Peer, who is ready to satisfy any Gentleman of Worth or Merit, who desires Conviction with Regard to the Point in Question.

Another Evidence produced against his Majesty (separate from the *Nuncio's Memoirs*) is Lord *Clarendon*. That this noble Historian should be appealed to in a Case, which affects the Character of King *Charles*, as an *honest Man*, I believe, will surprize the learned and impartial World. Lord *Clarendon* has spoke of his Majesty's moral and pious Character in the most clear and strong Terms; and yet the *Enquirer* will have it, that he is an Evidence in Favour of his own most invidious, conjectural Calumnies.

“ Lord

“ Lord CLARENDON’s *total Silence*, says the
 “ *Enquirer*, with respect to the Transactions of
 “ the Earl of Glamorgan in Ireland, in his *Hi-*
 “ *story of the Rebellion*, and his bare Mention of
 “ him in his *historical View of the Affairs of Ire-*
 “ *land*, p. 62, where he only says, *that the Con-*
 “ *cessions and Promises made by the Earl were*
 “ *disowned and disavowed by the Lord Lieute-*
 “ *nant before the Conclusion of the Peace, and the*
 “ *Earl committed for his Presumption*, afford
 “ strong Suspicion, that his Lordship thought
 “ it too tender a Point to be touched upon; tho’
 “ the Notoriety of those Transactions, in which
 “ his Majesty’s Character had been interested,
 “ made his Lordship’s Reserve the more re-
 “ markable.” (*Eng.* p. 314.)

This Charge will require a very short Answer.
 Either Lord Clarendon was acquainted with the
 Transactions of Glamorgan, or he was not; at
 least not so thoroughly as to be able to give a
 distinct and authentic Account of them. Upon
 either Supposition, Lord Clarendon’s Silence
 with regard to this Matter may easily be ac-
 counted for, *without affording the least Suspicion*
 that he thought his Majesty any ways privy to
 Glamorgan’s Transactions, or that he *imagined*
it too tender a Point to be touched upon, on that
Account.

If he was not acquainted with the Transac-
 tions of Glamorgan, he has evidently said as
 much of the Affair, as could be expected from
 an Historian of Credit and Integrity; he having
 told us, that the Concessions and Promises made
 by

by his Lordship were disowned and disavowed by the *Lord Lieutenant*, and that he was committed for his Presumption.

And if he was acquainted with the Affair, we must suppose him to have been told the whole of it; we must suppose him consequently to have been told, that *Glamorgan* had acted a very indiscreet Part; that his Connexion with the *Jesuits*, and his unhappy Turn of Mind, had put him upon the most unjustifiable Practices; and yet that amidst all this imprudent Conduct he still professed a sincere Attachment for his Majesty's Person and Service, and that the King himself believed, that *it was his misguided Zeal, rather than any Malice, which induced him to act as he did.*

Lord *Clarendon* knew further, that the *noble Family* had been strictly loyal, and advanced more Money for the Service of the King, than any Family in the Kingdom. And might not this be the Reason that our illustrious Historian has said so little of the Transactions of *Glamorgan*? of an unhappy Nobleman, descended from Ancestors, who had been remarkable for their Loyalty and Affection to their Prince?

But I lay no Stress upon Conjectures. This is certain, that Lord *Clarendon's* Silence with respect to *Glamorgan's* Transactions, could not proceed from any Suspicion he had of the King's being privy to them; Lord *Clarendon* having said such Things of his Majesty, as are utterly incompatible with the least Suspicion of this Kind; as make it almost impossible, that he should

should suspect the King of being guilty of such a vile, wicked, unwarrantable Conduct. Lord Clarendon has declared, that King Charles was, if any, *the most worthy the Title of an honest Man* : But what is more material, upon Supposition Lord Clarendon was thoroughly acquainted with the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, he must know, that his *Concessions and Promises were framed of his own Head, without the Privy of the King* ; his *Warrants and Powers* being arrant Forgeries, as hath been clearly shewn in the foregoing Observations.

Another Expedient, by which the *Enquirer* has endeavoured to asperse the Character of the Royal Martyr, is of a very *curious and artful* Nature ; but too trifling to be greatly regarded. He would have it, that the very Protestants of the King's Court and Party began very early to suspect his Majesty's steady Attachment to the Reformed Religion. *The Protestants*, says he, *of the King's Court and Party, were jealous very early of the Ascendant which the Queen and the Papists had over his Majesty, and dreaded the Consequence of it.*

It may be so ; and can it be wondered at, when the Papists themselves, *Irish Rebels*, and *English Catholics*, Puritans and Independents, all concurred to propagate the most impudent Lies and Calumnies with regard to this very Particular ? Nay, can the *Enquirer* himself be surprized, that *the Protestants of King Charles's Court and Party* should be jealous of his Majesty's Principles, when he himself has paid such

Regard .

Regard to Bigots of all Denominations, and wrote a Libel in Prejudice to his Majesty, which receives its chief Credit and Authority from the very same Lies and Calumnies of avowed Enemies to the Reformed Religion?

This Charge therefore (after what has been offered in Support of his Majesty's Protestant Principles) deserves little Regard; and, as I may possibly have an Opportunity of speaking to it more properly in another Place, I shall dismiss it at present, and leave the Reader to admire the wonderful historical and theological Learning, which the *Enquirer* has discovered upon the Occasion.

The *Enquirer* has not only endeavoured to make the *Jealousy of the Protestants* at the Court of King *Charles* serviceable to his Purpose, but *Jesuits*, *Popish Historians*, and *Irish Rebels*, are admitted as Evidence, and called in to testify, that *his Majesty was little better than a Papist, that he countenanced and commissioned Glamorgan in the most unjustifiable Practices.*

But does not the *Enquirer* plainly see, that it was the Interest, the detestable Policy of *Rome*, to make the World believe all this? Did not the *Irish Rebels* plead the Authority of the *King* for acting one of the most horrid Scenes of Cruelty, that ever was acted by a People, who call themselves Christians? And was not this the only Method, by which they could hope to succeed in their impious and barbarous Designs, of murdering their Fellow-Creatures, of subverting the Reformed Religion, and establishing

Popery? And yet the *Enquirer*, that zealous reformed Divine, *without Proof, without Foundation, in Contradiction to known Facts, to undeniable Evidence, upon the mere Strength of idle Tales* told by the determined Enemies to the Reformation, would insinuate, that a pious Protestant Prince was at the Bottom of all this Popish Barbarity; that a Prince who laid down his Life for the true Reformed Religion, was little better than a Papist; that he employed and authorized a Person to treat with the most cruel and unreasonable Men, to enable them to destroy his Subjects and extirpate the very Religion which he professed, and in which he lived and died. Let the Design of such a Writer be what it will, neither the Principles of Religion or Humanity will justify him in such an insolent and unjust Attack upon Truth, upon injured Majesty, upon Innocence, upon Virtue and Integrity.

However let us hear what *these Popish Writers* and *Irish Rebels* have said, with regard to the Point in Question. *The Irish Rebels*, says the *Enquirer*, *always professed, that they had undertaken the War in Defence of the King, against his rebellious Subjects in England.* (Enq. p. 307.)

To this I readily subscribe; but does it follow from hence, that the King commissioned them to take up Arms, or so much as countenanced or connived at their rebellious and barbarous Practices? No, the *Enquirer* knew the contrary.

He

He knew, that his Majesty took all the Care imaginable to suppress the very Beginnings and Motions towards an Insurrection in *Ireland*:

He knew that his Majesty, as early as *March 16, 1640*, commanded Sir *Henry Vane* to acquaint the Lords Justices of *Ireland*, with an Advice from abroad, and confirmed by his Ministers in *Spain*, that it was whispered about amongst the *Irish Friars* there, as if they expected a Rebellion in *Ireland*, and particularly in *Connaught*; that his Majesty thought fit to give their Lordships this Notice, that in their Wisdom they might manage the same with that Dexterity and Secrecy, as to discover and prevent so pernicious a Design, if such there should be *.

He knew that the King, as soon as the News of the *Irish Massacre* was brought to him in *Scotland*, wrote immediately to the two Houses, that *he was satisfied it was no rash Insurrection, but a formed Rebellion, which must be prosecuted by a sharp War; the conducting and prosecuting whereof, he wholly committed to their Care and Wisdom, and depended upon them for carrying it on; and that for the present, he had caused a strong Regiment of 1500 Foot, under good Officers, to be transported out of Scotland into Ulster, for the Relief of those Parts*†.

The *Enquirer* knew, " That his Majesty had
 " earnestly desired the two Houses to consider
 " the bleeding Condition of *Ireland*, and that
 " neither the Importunities of the King, nor

* See *Rapin*. † *Clar*. Vol. I. p. 238.

“ the Necessity of the Protestants in that Kingdom, could persuade them to levy one Man towards the Suppression of the Rebels, till the King had disclaimed his Power of pressing Soldiers by an Act of Parliament, and thereby laid himself open to such Violence as was then hammering against him * ”.

He knew further, that his Majesty had proclaimed the *Irish, Rebels and Traitors*, as soon as the Parliament had applied to him for that Purpose †.

He knew, that the Rebels, who were taken Prisoners, all declared at the Expence of their Lives, that they knew nothing of a Commission from the King, and confessed, that the Commission, by which they acted, was a Forgery of their own ‡.

What then, it may be asked, could the *Enquirer* mean, by this invidious Suggestion? Why, *that the King* (notwithstanding all that has been here alledged) *had a favourable Opinion of the Irish Rebels; that he considered them as his Friends, who had taken up Arms in his Defence; and that he secretly countenanced, at least connived at what they did.*

But what Authority has the *Enquirer* for all this? Why, the idle, unsupported Assertion of a Jesuit. *The Popish Author*, says he, *of the late Church History of England, from the Year 1500, to the Year 1688, makes no Scruple to affirm, that the King himself had this Opinion*

* *Grey's Exam.* p. 291. † See the foregoing Pages.

‡ See p. 265.

of the Irish that were in Arms, as it appeared by several undeniable Proofs*.

But why are not these several, undeniable Proofs produced? The impartial Reader is left to guess. If these Proofs were such as the Proof which the *Enquirer* has given us, I think it was great Prudence to conceal them.

The Proof produced by the *Enquirer* in Support of this conjectural Calumny, is such as I will venture to say, is not to be paralleled. He tells us, that Sir *Edward Walker*, Secretary of War to King *Charles*, had with great Diligence and Observation, committed to Writing in a Paper-Book, the several Occurrences which passed in the King's Army, and the Victories obtained by his Majesty over his rebellious Subjects; that this Book was perused and corrected by his Majesty; and that, where Sir *Edward Walker* had taken Occasion to speak of the *Irish* and called them *Rebels*, his Majesty did, among other Alterations made therein, with his own Hand, put out the Word *Rebels*, and over it wrote *Irish*. And admitting the Fact, might not his Majesty make this Alteration without having a very great Opinion of the *Irish* Rebels? Might he not think, that sharp Expressions, tho' very just, would be more likely to exasperate, than soften the Resentment of a desperate, bloody People?

Is it possible that any one, but the sagacious *Enquirer*, could have discovered such great and terrible Consequences, as he has drawn from

* *Eng.* p. 307.

this little Emendation? Is it possible that any one but himself could, from such a Circumstance, have discovered that his Majesty secretly countenanced the Insurrection and Rebellion of the *Irish*? that he considered a People, whom he had proclaimed Rebels and Traitors, as his Friends, as Subjects, who had taken up Arms in his Defence?

But the idle Nature of such conjectural Stuff (for it can't be called Reasoning) will be best illustrated by a Case, that is plain and easy.

A Gentleman, upon reading a certain Enquiry, being a little provoked at the Author's poultry Prevarication, was pleased to observe, *This Author is certainly a Quaker, or something worse, and was I to answer him I would tell him so.* By no means, says his Friend; harsh Expressions serve rather to exasperate than convince. Treat a Writer with Civility, and you may think of him as he deserves. You may consider him as a *Quaker, a Tool to Jesuitism, a superficial artful Wrangler, a Mirror of Coffee-house Chit-chat, of peripatetic Learning*, and he cannot blame you.

The Charge itself is below Criticism. Supposing it to be true, it is evidently nothing to the Purpose, and can be of no Weight, when confronted by a Series of such undeniable Facts, of such irrefragable Evidence, as hath been already laid before the Reader. To take any great Notice of it therefore, would be an Affront to Men of Sense, who must know it to be not only idle and impertinent, but false and groundless.

From the Account which the *Enquirer* himself has given of *this Emendation*, it appears to have been rather made by the King's Enemies, than by his Majesty himself. It must be considered, that this *Paper-Book* fell into the Hands of the English Rebels, when Forgeries were frequently practised in Prejudice to the King; that General *Fairfax*, *Rushworth*, Clerk-Assistant to the Parliament, *Lilly*, that infamous Republican, &c. are said to have seen and complained of the Emendation. How can the *Enquirer* be certain, that it was not made by *some one of the Party*? Persons who first find or discover lost or stolen Goods, are not thought always to be guiltless.

But be this as it will, the *Enquirer's* own Account of the Affair makes it extremely probable, that the Emendation was not made by the King. Sir *Edward Walker* is said to have copied the Book, to have given the Copy to the King, and to have kept the Original; and tho' he owned that his Majesty had corrected the Original in many Places, yet he protested, that he never observed the Alteration above-mentioned; that he knew of no such Emendation made by the King. Whether a Person, who wrote the Original, who transcribed it for the King, after it had undergone his Majesty's Corrections, can be supposed, not to have known, not to have observed, such an Emendation, I leave the impartial World to judge.

But the *Popish Writer* above-mentioned has said something more of King *Charles*. He has told

told us, that he was almost a Papist, that he entertained favourable Sentiments of the Church of Rome; and the *Enquirer* has taken no small Pains to make his Readers believe it. So that here our *Protestant Divine* has evidently done the Work of the *Jesuit*; he, together with the *Jesuit*, having endeavoured to fix upon his Majesty an Imputation, which, it is well known, was one of those Artifices that the *Jesuits*, in the Reign of King *Charles*, and afterwards in the Reign of King *James II.* made serviceable to the Cause of Popery.

One of their latest Authors, says the *Enquirer*, in his Church History of *England*, from the Year 1500 to the Year 1688, affirms, that we have good Grounds to think, that his Majesty was not so much an Enemy either to the Discipline or the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, as many Persons are who call themselves Protestants.

The Proofs of this Assertion will be considered immediately, and are such, as, I think, cannot fail to divert the serious Reader: In the mean time, he will please to remember,

That it has been fully proved in the foregoing Observations, that King *Charles* was thoroughly convinced of the superstitious and corrupt Tenets of the Church of Rome, and gave the strongest Testimonies imaginable of his steady and sincere Attachment to, and Affection for, the Reformed Religion, established amongst us.

What then, it may be asked, can be meant by the above invidious Insinuation? Why, that

the Religion, which his Majesty professed, bordered upon the Corruptions of the Church of Rome; that there is no great Difference *between the Doctrines and Discipline* of that corrupt Communion, and the *Doctrines and Discipline* of the Church of England. This is the plain, obvious Design of the Charge; and it is remarkable, that the same Charge was urged against us by Popish Writers in a late Popish Reign, this being thought the most effectual Method to prejudice our People against the Establishment.

And indeed that Popish Writers should have Recourse to this Artifice, in order to unsettle the Minds of our People, is not surprizing; but that such an Affinity should be found between the Artifices of *Papists*, and those who call themselves *Protestants*, that our *Protestant Divine* should take up with the most infamous Insinuations of the avowed Enemies of our Church, Insinuations evidently designed to pervert and debauch the Principles of the Members of our Communion, rather than not asperse the Memory of the *Royal Martyr*, must afford Room for more than ordinary Speculation.

But let us hear the Proofs, which the Popish Writer and the Enquirer have alledged in Support of this Aspersion upon his Majesty. These then are,

I. An idle, nonsensical Tale, given us by another Popish Writer (one *Panzani* the Pope's Agent in England) about a small Piece of Wood, which was found in the *Tower of London*, and
said

said to have been a Piece of the Cross on which our Saviour suffered.

2. An Expression, which his Majesty made use of, after hearing a Sermon from one of his Preachers, upon Schism.

3. An Abstract from *Collier's History*.

1. To trouble the Reader with a Repetition of the whole Story, which *Panzani* has given us of the *supposed Piece of our Saviour's Cross*, would be an Insult upon common Sense. Great Care, it seems, was taken to have it placed in a Box, on which was bestowed some Pains in the Workmanship. The Queen, who probably liked such Things, hearing that it was to be lodged amongst vulgar Curiosities, desired that it might be delivered to her. The King, who was the best of Husbands, told her in a very complaisant Manner, that *no one had a greater Value for Things of that Nature, and he would take care that it should neither be an Object of Derision nor of Curiosity*. This is one Argument which the Popish Writer has given us, to prove, that King *Charles* was no Enemy to the *Doctrine* or *Discipline* of the Church of *Rome*. And a notable one it is, if I mistake not, such as I shall venture to leave with the Reader without a further Remark.

2. The *next Proof* is of the same trifling Nature, and what, I verily think, no sincere Protestant, who had not been greatly distressed, would have mentioned. But any the most idle Tales, or arrant Falsehoods, invented by the professed Enemies of our Church, by the ac-

knowledge'd Authors of pious Frauds, are raked together, and set in the most glaring Light, in order to asperse the Memory of a murdered Sovereign.

One of the King's Preachers, says *Panzani*, having vehemently declaimed against Schism, his Majesty being present, was afterwards heard to say, *that he would have parted with one of his Hands, that a Schism had not happened.* And what then? Does it follow from hence, that the King was a Friend to Popery? Yes; *Panzani* and the *Enquirer* would have it so: They would have it, that the King spoke of the Schism of the Church of *England*. Base Misrepresentation!

The Preacher was a Protestant, a Member of the Church of *England*, and consequently must be supposed to have preached against Schism in general, against the *popish* and *puritanical* *Defection* from the pure, primitive, reformed Church, of which he was a Member. The King therefore, sensible of the Guilt of Schism, of Divisions and Distractions in the Church of Christ, declared, I wish, I had lost one of my Hands, that no such Schism had ever happened; *i. e.* That neither the *Papists*, by requiring *sinful and idolatrous Terms of Communion*, nor the *Puritans*, by making *unnecessary Divisions in the Church of Christ*, had ever been guilty of the great Sin of Schism.

That this was his Majesty's Meaning, is clear from several Parts of his Works, where it appears to have been his constant Opinion, that
the

the *Papists* and *Puritans*, &c. *not the Members of the Church of England, were properly Schismatics.* So that upon the whole, the Argument of the *Popish Writer* and the *Enquirer* is plainly this: A Preacher of the Church of England declaimed vehemently against Schism, against Schismatics of all Denominations, against Papists, Puritans, &c. and the King in Fact approved of the Sermon; declaring, that *he would rather have parted with one of his Hands than that such a Schism should ever have happened;* and from hence the *Popish Writer* and the *Protestant Divine* would insinuate, that the King was no Enemy to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of Rome.

3. The next Proof, from *Collier's History*, is still more curious, and will enable us to judge of the *Enquirer's* great Knowledge in Divinity, and his sincere Attachment to the Church of England.

The *Popish Historian*, says the *Enquirer*, subjoins a third Passage from Mr. *Collier's History*, which, he observes, gives us his Majesty's Opinion, as to the capital Controversy between the two Churches, that of England and Rome; viz. the Controversy concerning the Interpretation of Scripture.

And what follows from hence? As to the capital Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, does the *Popish Historian* intimate, that his Majesty's Opinion and the Opinion of the Church of Rome, had any Affinity with each other? Or does the Ac-

count which Mr. Collier has given us of his Majesty's Sentiments, imply any such Thing? If not, to what Purpose are Quotations made from the *Popish Historian*, or from Mr. Collier?

The *Enquirer's* Design is plainly to insinuate, that King Charles was no Enemy to the Discipline or Doctrine of the Church of Rome *. It may not be improper therefore to see how this Matter stands, to see what the Opinion of the Church of Rome is, with regard to the Point in Question; what the Opinion of the Church of England; what the Opinion of King Charles I. and whether the *Enquirer* had any the least Reason to draw such an invidious Conclusion in Prejudice to his Majesty's Character.

The whole, which the *Enquirer* has given us upon this Particular, is as follows. " The " *Popish Historian* subjoins a third Passage from " Mr. Collier's Ecclesiastical History †, which, " he observes, gives us his Majesty's Opinion, " as to the capital Controversy between the two " Churches, that of England and Rome. While " his Majesty was detained in the Scottish Army " he was attacked by Alexander Henderson, a " learned Presbyterian Minister of that Nation, " who objected to the Church of England, as " still standing in need of a farther Reformation, " which he engaged to make out from the " Scriptures. Now the King in his Answer " tells Henderson, that notwithstanding the pre- " tended Defects in the English Reformation, " both those, and all other Controversies, were

* See *Enq.* p. 296. † Vol. II. B. ix. p. 846.

" to

“to be referred to another Kind of Tribunal
 “than the Scripture explained by private
 “Heads *.”

The King, says Mr. *Collier*, for settling the Sense of controverted Places in Scripture, had appealed to the Practice of the primitive Church and the general Consent of the *Fathers*. The King alledged, that *Henderson* ought either to submit to the Authority of these Judges, or find out better; *that he had done neither*, nor yet shewn *how*, by declining these Authorities, the Mischief of interpreting Scripture by a private Spirit, can be prevented. Again †, since no Prophecy or Scripture is of private Interpretation, his Majesty infers, 1st, “That Scripture
 “is to be interpreted. 2^{dly}, That the Catholic
 “Church being the surest Guide, and the most
 “public Authority, ought to be appealed to,
 “when the Meaning of the Holy Ghost is con-
 “tested. *And tho’ Scripture is best interpreted
 “by itself, when parallel Places occur, and the
 “Case will bear it, does it follow from hence,
 “that all other Methods are unlawful ‡ ?*

* It was reported, says *Collier*, that *Henderson’s* being worsted in the Controversy, threw him into a deep Melancholy, which ended in a mortal Distemper. Some say he died a Convert to his Majesty, and that he did him the Justice of an extraordinary Character in managing a Debate of this Nature, p. 848. See this Particular proved in the *Case of the Royal Martyr*, Vol. I. p. 66.

† *Coll.* Vol. II. B. ix. p. 848.

‡ This whole Sentence, which gives us his Majesty’s real Sentiments, with Regard to the Point in Question, is entirely omitted by the *Enquirer*; with what Design let the Reader judge. See *Collier*, Vol. II. p. 848.

“ And

And thus since the *King* and *Henderson* differ about the Meaning of the Scripture, his Majesty concludes, there must be a Rule or a Judge between them, to give Force to their Proofs, to make their Arguments bear, and put an End to the Controversy."

Is it possible, that any one can infer from hence, that *King Charles*, as to the capital Controversy, between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, was no Enemy to the Opinions of the latter?

The Opinion of the CHURCH OF ROME, with Regard to the Interpretation of Scripture, it is well known, is, that the Church (by which they mean the Church of Rome, or the Pope, or the Governors of the Romish Church assembled in Council) is the sole Judge of controverted Places in Scripture.

That her oral Traditions are of equal Authority with the written Word of God; and

That her Interpretations of Scripture are of such an unerring Nature, so agreeable to Truth, as not to be rejected by Christians upon Pain of Damnation.

PROTESTANTS on the other Hand, of almost all Denominations, agree, that the Scriptures are the Rule of their Faith and Practice; and disagree only in the Method, how difficult Places are to be interpreted.

The CHURCH OF ENGLAND acknowledges, that the Scriptures are the Rule of her Faith and Practice; and where parallel Places of Scripture occur, where a Light may be thrown upon

Passages

Passages of an *obscure, vague, or indeterminate* Meaning, by Passages of a Meaning *more plain and obvious*, she is of Opinion, that Scripture is best interpreted by itself.

Next to *this Expedient*, she thinks, that an Appeal to the Sense of the Primitive Church is the likeliest Method to assist her in settling the Meaning of controverted Points; and that the best Interpretation of difficult Passages of Scripture, is that which is most agreeable to Catholic Antiquity, to the unanimous Sentiments and Practices of the Church in the first and purest Ages of it.

Whilst she pays this Deference to Antiquity, she at the same time looks upon the *Fathers*, as neither infallible nor impeccable; and lays little more Stress upon their Sentiments of Points, in which they differ, than upon the Sentiments of learned and able Divines in the present Age.

In a Word, as to the Sentiments of the *Fathers* with regard to Points, in which they do or do not differ, the Church of *England* pays no Regard to any, but only to those which are found agreeable to the written Word of God; and as to Points, of which their Sentiments are not only unanimous, but consonant with the Word of God, she is of Opinion, that *more Regard* is due to them, than to the Sentiments of the *present Age*. As the Primitive Fathers lived near the Apostolical Times, she presumes, they had better Opportunities of knowing the Meaning of the Scriptures, than we can at this Distance. These, if I mistake not, are the Sentiments

timents of the Church of *England*, with regard to the Interpretation of the Word of God. And, agreeable to this,

King *Charles*, in the very Dispute which he had with *Henderſon*, and which is now quoted by the *Enquirer* to his Majesty's Difadvantage, declared, that *where the Sense of the Scriptures was doubtful, an Appeal to Catholic Antiquity was the likeliest Means to put an End to Disputes; but that where parallel Places of Scripture occurred, and the Case would bear it, Scripture was best interpreted by itself.*

Again, I believe, says the King, the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, and the universal Practice of the Primitive Church, to be the best and most authentic Interpreters of God's Word; and yet, *I never esteemed any Authority equal to the Scriptures.* Cellier, p. 848.

Another Argument of the *King's*, quoted by the *Enquirer* himself, is remarkable, and plainly implies, that his Majesty looked upon *the Scripture as the best Interpreter of itself*, as the sole Rule of his Faith and Practice, and that he appealed to the Practice of the Church and the Sentiments of the *Fathers*, merely for settling the Sense of controverted Places of Scripture; Places, which by his Antagonist were thought not perfectly clear and express.

Henderſon had objected to the Church of *England*; as still standing in need of a farther Reformation; and particularly insisted, that *Episcopacy* was not warrantable, which he engaged to make good from Scripture. As to the Point

of *Episcopacy*, it is certain, that he failed in his Proofs; that Scripture fairly and properly interpreted, was found at least to be full as clear for Episcopacy, as for any other Kind of Government whatsoever. To this *Henderson* demurred. The *King* and *Henderson* therefore differing about the *Meaning of Scripture*, his Majesty appealed to the Practice of the Primitive Church, and the general Consent of the Fathers. And when it appeared, that *the Sense*, which his Majesty had given the Scriptures, was agreeable to the Practice of the Universal Church for fifteen hundred Years together, and that *the Sense* which Mr. Henderson had put upon the same controverted Places of Scripture, was utterly inconsistent with the universal Practice of the Church during that Period, the King thought that Henderson ought to submit, ought to be determined by Scripture interpreted agreeably to Catholic Antiquity, unless he could produce better Evidence; *i. e.* unless he could produce plain Scripture Proofs for what he had advanced.

Here it is observable, that his Majesty, throughout the whole Dispute, acted upon Protestant Principles, that he declared the Scripture to be the best Interpreter of itself, and that where he and his Antagonist differed about the Meaning of it, an Appeal to *Catholic Antiquity* was the likeliest and best Means to put an End to all Disputes between them. And yet this is the Conduct, for which the *Enquirer* would insinuate that his Majesty had no *Disinclination* to
the

the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of Rome.

If a Prince must be charged with Popery for such Behaviour as this, it would be Matter of Curiosity to know the Principles of a Writer, who professes himself a Member of the Established Church, and yet blames the Conduct of a Prince for acting in strict Conformity with the Sentiments of that very Church, of which the Writer is presumed to be a *subscribing Member*.

After what has been said, I shall only put a Case, and leave it to the Consideration of the *Enquirer*.

A Presbyterian Writer of some Character hath these Words*: *The Bible, said Mr. Chillingworth, is the Religion of Protestants.*

In Answer to this Position, says a Popish Writer, "Pray, Sir, of which Sort of Protestants? of Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Anabaptists, or Arians, or Socinians? For all equally call themselves Protestants, and all equally pretend to the Bible. Does then the Bible teach the Lutherans to hold the real Presence and the Calvinists to deny it? Does the Bible authorize the Presbyterians to baptize Infants, and the Anabaptists to condemn that Baptism? Does the same Bible teach the Arians and Socinians, that Christ is a Creature, and other Protestants, that he is the eternal Creator of all Things? If not, it is

* See Mr. Barker's Sermon preached at Satter's Hall, p. 33.

“ not the Bible that is their Religion, but their
 “ own Whims, which they are pleased to fa-
 “ ther upon the Bible†.”

The *Dissenters*, upon their professed Principles, I fancy, will find some Difficulty to answer this Argument, without maintaining the greatest Absurdity; without maintaining, that the Scriptures may be urged in Favour of the most opposite and contradictory Doctrines and Tenets.

But by the Members of the Church of *England* the same Argument, or rather the same Piece of plausible Sophistry, is easily obviated. The *Church of England* has nothing to do with the rigid, nonsensical Doctrines of *Luther* or *Calvin*, with the illiterate Notions of *Anabaptists*, with *modern Enthusiasm*, or the blasphemous Tenets of *Arius* or *Socinus*. She reformed upon a very different Plan! She holds no Doctrines or Opinions, but what are warranted from Scripture, and consistent with the purest Antiquity, with the universal Practice and Sentiments of *Christians* in the first Ages of the Church. She can therefore truly say, that the Bible contains the Religion of her Members; that the principal Points in which she differs from the Church of *Rome*, are those, in which that corrupt Communion has evidently deviated from both Scripture and Antiquity.

The Church of *Rome* indeed pretends to Antiquity, but has really little or no Pretensions

† See a *Specimen of the Spirit of the Dissenting Teachers*, by a Popish Writer, p. 22.

to it at all ; her corrupt and idolatrous Practices being the Growth of Ages of a much later Date, than what are properly called the Ages of pure and primitive Christianity. These her Errors and Corruptions therefore the *Church of England* either reformed or utterly discharged, making the Scriptures the Rule and Standard of her Faith and Practice, and appealing to Antiquity as far as Antiquity was found conformable with Scripture and Reason.

The Advocates for Popery are by this Means entirely disarmed, and their pretended Argument from Antiquity, upon which their grossest Corruptions are founded, is proved to be no Argument at all ; nothing but an Argument drawn from the corrupt Ages of the Church, which they would make the World believe are the pure and primitive Ages of it.

But how will our Protestant Dissenters get rid of the above Difficulty, or obviate this Piece of Sophistry ? Why, they must say, if they would say any thing to the Purpose, that *the Scriptures, well interpreted, are a flat Contradiction to the corrupt Tenets and Practices of the Church of Rome.* And in this they say what is true, and what all Protestants are agreed in. The Scriptures, well interpreted, clearly shew that the Church of *Rome* is wrong, that we had just Reason to separate from her, that a Reformation was absolutely necessary.

But supposing the Church of *Rome* to be wrong ; can Dissenters of so many different Denominations be sure, that their Interpretations

tions of Scripture are right? Can every Sect be right? Or, can the Bible be the Religion of them all? Will the Scriptures, as was said before, warrant the Notions of *Lutherans*, rigid *Calvinists*, *Anabaptists*, *Trinitarians*, *Antitrinitarians*, *Arians*, *Socinians*, and the most opposite, blasphemous, and absurd Opinions? Here then, I presume, the Reasoning of our Dissenters must be defective; and when this Defect shall be supplied by any other Expedient than what is before-mentioned and recommended, I shall be thankful for the Information *.

* A proper Method of interpreting the Will of God is a Matter of great Consequence; and for fear what has already been advanced upon this Point may be mistaken, I shall beg Leave to be a little more explicit.

It is already granted, that *the Scriptures are the Rule of our Faith and Practice*; that in them is contained the Religion of the Reformed Church of Christ;

That all Things necessary to Salvation are plain and easy;

That every Christian has a Right to read the Scriptures, and to make use of that Judgment in interpreting them, which God has been pleased to bless him withal.

All this I readily grant, and doubt not, but every one, who modestly and conscientiously reads the Will of God, with an Intention to know his Duty; every one consequently, who makes use of such Helps and Assistances, as Providence has generally furnished him with, may know enough to *make him wise unto Salvation*.

But does it follow from hence, that all the opposite, contradictory, absurd Opinions of Protestants, are contained in the Bible? Or that every illiterate Person, who is capable of reading it in his Mother-Tongue, is capable of interpreting it, without proper Helps and Assistance? Utterly impossible: Nor do we want a Pope, or an infallible Judge, to supply the Defect, to determine or set us right in Matters which concern our Salvation, or in any religious Matters whatsoever. An infallible Judge, in this probational State, would be little less than an Absurdity. Such an Appointment would rather obstruct, than

Another Evidence produced by the *Enquirer* in order to prove, that the *King* was privy to, and countenanced *Glamorgan* in his Negotia-

promote the Interest of true Virtue and Piety. It would leave but little Room for the free Exercise of either Virtue, Piety, or Faith; and is utterly inconsistent with the express Design of the Christian Institution, as might easily be shewn, if Occasion required.

Christians want only *proper Guides*; *proper Helps* and *Assistances*. If they call in such Helps, as God has provided for their Instruction, they evidently do what is required of them; and all Errors of Ignorance, which such serious Enquirers after Truth may be guilty of, must of Consequence be pardonable. But is this the Case of Men who neglect the Means of Instruction, who interpret the Will of God according to their own private Fancies, without applying to such Assistances as are evidently serviceable for that Purpose?

In the Scriptures, it is confessed, *all things necessary to Salvation are plain and easy*. But to whom are they plain and easy? to all Mankind, to the Ignorant as well as Learned, to those who do not desire to be instructed, to those who obstinately persist to espouse the Prejudices in which they are educated? Can the necessary Truths of Salvation be plain and easy to such Men; or have such Men Reason to complain, should they be given up to believe a Lye?

Upon Supposition God has revealed his Will to Mankind, he has certainly furnished them with Means to understand it. To suppose otherwise, is to impeach infinite Wisdom and Goodness; is to suppose, that God has published a Will, which cannot possibly answer the End for which it was intended. The Helps or Means of Information therefore, which God has given us for the Interpretation of his Will, we are evidently obliged to have Recourse to. Without applying to such Expedients, we have no Reason to complain (as was said before) if God should punish us with Delusion, and suffer us to believe a Lye.

It may possibly be asked therefore, what those Helps or Means of Information are? I answer; If a Man would understand the Will of God, it is necessary,

1. That he should read it with a *modest and sincere Intention* to understand and practise the Duties contained therein;
 2. That he should compare Scripture with Scripture, and endeavour to illustrate obscure Passages by those which are more plain and easy; and,
 3. That he should apply for Advice to such as are appointed by
- tions

tions with the *Irish*, is Father *George Leyburn*, who wrote some Memoirs of what he did and what he observed in *Ireland* in 1647. But

God to advise and assist him in difficult Cases. To this End, he should at least pay such a Deference to their Opinions, as is usually paid to those, with whom he advises in Points which concern his Health or temporal Affairs. If he should find, that their Instructions are inconsistent with the Will of God; if it should appear, that his Guides and Instructors have deceived him, he is justly warranted in applying for further Instruction; for the best Information he can get, in a Case of such great Importance. And when he has done this, without Prejudice or Partiality, he has done his Duty. If after all he should labour under some Mistakes, they can be of no very ill Consequence to himself. The Guilt of them must lie at *another's Door*; at his, who deceived him.

Here a Question naturally arises, which may possibly deserve some Notice. Is it not clear from hence, that Christians *should first apply for Advice to their lawful Ministers; to those, who are regularly ordained* and appointed to be their spiritual Guides and Pastors? If a People should neglect the Instructions of their lawful Pastors, should suffer themselves to be carried about with *divers and strange Doctrines*, and follow after Teachers who have no regular Commission, can such People be properly said to make use of those Assistances, those Guides, which God has appointed for their Information, for helping them to know the Sense of his Will?

To say, that regular Pastors may not be able to direct or assist Christians in interpreting the Scriptures, is idle and ignorant. They may, and must reasonably be supposed, at least to understand them as well as other Men; and Christians have this Advantage in applying to them for their Instructions, that they do what the Will of God has directed them to do; that they have Recourse to such Helps, as God himself has appointed.

All Men are confessibly fallible, and yet regular Pastors, as was hinted before, may at least be supposed to know the Will of God as well as other Men, and are generally well qualified to consult the original Text, to compare Scripture with Scripture, and to satisfy serious Enquirers, whether such Doctrines and Practices were the Doctrines and Practices of the Universal Church, in the first and purest Ages of it.

The peculiar mistaken Opinions of ancient Writers, and the Interpolations of ancient Records, cannot possibly affect the Point in Question. The Fathers were Men liable to Mistakes, as well

whether the *Enquirer* has been more successful in his Quotations from this Popish Writer, than

as ourselves, and Interpolations are confessedly found in the Records of Antiquity. The Church of *England* admits of both these Positions, but is of Opinion, that they are very little to the Purpose for which they are generally alledged, it being certain, that she lays no Stress upon Antiquity, but what is conformable with the Scripture and Reason. The Question therefore is not, whether the Fathers were fallible, or whether ancient Records have been interpolated : The Question between the Church of *England* and those who dissent from her, with regard to Interpretation of Scripture, is of a very different Nature. *If the Sense of a Passage of Scripture is supported by the general Sentiments, and universal Practice of the Primitive Church, the Question is, Whether we may not justly conclude that SENSE to be the BEST SENSE which can be put upon it ?*

This Question may possibly be liable to the Sneers of unthinking illiterate People, and has actually admitted of another Question of a very extraordinary Nature. *Is it necessary, say they, that Christians, in order to be saved, should know the Sentiments of the Primitive Church ?*

But this Question, however plausible, serves only to shew the Ignorance of those who ask it, and is easily answered by another, viz. *Is it necessary, that Christians should understand the Scriptures, and know as much of their Duty, as their respective Capacities, and their respective Situations in Life will admit of ?* That this is necessary, I presume, will readily be granted ; and yet, it is most certain, that the Bulk of Mankind cannot possibly attain to such a Degree of Knowledge without the Help and Assistance of proper Guides and Instructors. Guides and Instructors therefore are evidently necessary, at least for the Ignorant and Unlearned ; and as God has appointed such, Christians, who apply to them with a modest and honest Intention, to know the Divine Will, to know and practise their Duty, may rest securely under such a Conduct : They need not, at least, be under any Apprehensions of forfeiting the Privileges of their Salvation.

I have here pointed out a Method of interpreting Scripture, which is perfectly consistent with Reason ; which is suited to the Capacities of rational Creatures, and which in all Probability will answer the End, for which the Will of God was revealed to Mankind.

I suppose no implicit Regard paid to the Opinions of any Man or Men whatsoever ; I only suppose such a Deference paid to the Advice or Instructions of proper Guides, as is usually paid by
from

from the former, the Reader, I presume, will soon be able to judge.

Mankind to Persons of other Professions, with whom they advise, in Points of Health and secular Affairs.

I have called in the Assistance of an infallible Judge, being well satisfied, that there is no such *Man* upon Earth, nor any Occasion for such a one. I am thoroughly convinced, that such a Judge would not be consistent with the free Exercise of Virtue, Piety or Faith, nor consequently with the Design of the Christian Institution.

I have only endeavoured to shew the Absurdity of the other Extreme; of those rash Attempts to interpret the holy Will of God, which proceed from the private Whims and Fancies of Men, who either neglect or despise such Aids or Helps as in some Cases are absolutely necessary. And when the learned *Enquirer* shall give us a better Method for interpreting Scripture than is here proposed, when he shall give us a better Method for obviating the corrupt and idolatrous Practices of the Church of *Rome*, or indeed for answering the paultry Argument of the Popish Writer above-mentioned, I will gratefully and publicly acknowledge the Favour.

The above Method of interpreting Scripture is the Method which has been made use of by the ablest Advocates for the Reformed Religion, and by which they have successfully exposed the Errors and Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*. And yet this very Method, our most zealous Protestant, the *Enquirer*, has taken no small Pains to decry and represent as popish, at least bordering upon Popery. That an Expedient, from whence Popery has received the most fatal Blow, that was ever given it, since it was established in the Christian World, should be popish, or bordering upon Popery, is something strange. And yet the *Enquirer* will have it so; he will have it, that the strong Fortress at *Rome* must be attacked with Ammunition of another Kind. If it should chance to be such as he has employed against poor King *Charles*, I verily think Popery attacked by our Protestant Champion must make an Appearance not unlike a Tree in Autumn: The Body of it may possibly be untouched, but the Shrouds must naturally look dismal, the Leaves continually dropping at every Puff of inoffensive Air. How happy the Age, which is blest with a Divine thus eminent for demolishing Superstition and Idolatry; and, like the famous *Barclay*, making the idle Tales and sorry Reasoning of puritanical and popish Artifice, the Test of Protestantism.

Leyburn, it is granted, talks of Commissions and Instructions, which the Earl of *Glamorgan* received from the King; but what does he say of them upon the whole? Why, he expressly tells us, that they were disclaimed by his Majesty, and that the Earl was imprisoned for pretending to them.

He observes indeed, that the *Nuncio* and the Bishop of *Clogher* had assured him, *that no Man could doubt, but my Lord of Worcester's [Glamorgan's] Commissions were real, they being signed with the King's Hand and Seal.* As to the King's Hand and Seal or Sign-Manual, enough has been said of it already. The Question is, what Authority the *Nuncio* and the Bishop of *Clogher* had, for saying that *Glamorgan's* Commissions were Commissions from the King? Now the only Authority which they had for it was, that *Glamorgan* told them so. So that the whole of Father *George's* Evidence rests upon the Credit of *Glamorgan*, which [unlucky for the *Enquirer* and his Evidence] happens to be such as can have no Weight in the present Case, it having been already proved, that his Commissions were arrant Forgeries.

With what Intention therefore this Popish Missionary is produced as an Evidence, is difficult to guess, unless to insinuate, that the Queen had sent him to *Ireland* to negotiate a Peace with the *Irish* Catholics, exclusive of the Lord Lieutenant, and to assure them of better Terms than his Lordship was commissioned to grant them. But from the *Enquirer's* own Account
of

of this Matter, it appears, that this could not be the Case, the Lord Lieutenant being still considered as the principal Person, who had any Authority to transact that Affair.

Amongst the Letters which the Queen sent to *Ireland* by Father *Leyburn*, Letters are expressly said to be sent to the Lord Lieutenant, *Leyburn*, says the *Enquirer*, having received many Letters from the Queen to the Lord Lieutenant, to Lord *Digby*, the Nuncio, and the Clergy, &c. departed from *Paris* in his Way to *Ireland*, March 16, 1647.

In another Place *Leyburn* observes, "That the King, my Master, being in that Condition, as they did well know, had given the Queen, and Prince of *Wales*, Power to treat and conclude in the Business of *Ireland*; who accordingly had been pleased, not only to send me with Letters and Instructions to my Lord Lieutenant, but also with Letters to all the principal Persons and corporate Towns amongst them." (*Eng.* p. 326.)

So that here is an Evidence produced, that does not say a single Syllable to the *Enquirer's* Purpose. *Leyburn* does not pretend to offer a Word in support of the Reality of *Glamorgan's* Authority, or in Prejudice either to the King or Queen. He owns, on the other Hand, that he was charged with Letters to the Lord Lieutenant; that consequently his Excellency was properly acquainted with the whole Design of the said *Leyburn's* Agency, agreeable to the above-mentioned Declaration of her Majesty to

Sir *Kenelm Digby*, who observed, that the *Business of that Kingdom [Ireland]* was already in those Hands that were best able to manage it; and that whatsoever was sought for there, must not be expected from any but the Lord Lieutenant. (See Lord Digby's Letter to the Duke of Ormond, dated June 17, 1646.)

A Word or two more with regard to the Artifices of the *Enquirer*, and I shall relieve the Reader, who, I dare say, will be gladly relieved from attending to the Examination of such a Collection of loose, disjointed, superficial, inconclusive Stuff.

Whilst his Majesty was in the *Scottish Army*, he was treated more like a *Prisoner* than a *Prince*, by those false, treacherous, and traitorous Rebels. A Correspondence with his Friends was rendered in some Measure impracticable, the *French Ambassador* (who was allowed to visit him) being the only Person, by whom he could transmit a Letter even to the Queen, the Prince, &c. By this *Ambassador* he got Letters convey'd to *Paris*, wherein he desired the Queen, the Prince, and all his faithful Servants, to govern themselves jointly, according to what they should judge to be the true Interest of his Crown and Posterity.

In Consequence of these Instructions, *Father Leyburn* was dispatched to Ireland with fourteen Blanks to the Lord Lieutenant, which he was authorized to fill up in such Manner and to such Purpose, and with such Contents, as he should think

think most proper for the Service of the King in his Irish Affairs, &c. (Enq. p. 337.)

“ Father *Leyburn* was likewise ordered to
 “ acquaint the *Lord Lieutenant*, that if in the
 “ Treaty of the Peace, in the Conclusion there-
 “ of, he desired to be assisted with any further
 “ Authority, grounded upon any Letters sent to
 “ him from the King or otherwise in our Power ;
 “ then we desire him the said *Lord Lieutenant*,
 “ to fill up the Blanks signed by us or the Prince,
 “ or any other of the said Blanks, signed either
 “ by us or the Prince, with such Authority from
 “ us, and from us and the Prince, or from the
 “ Prince only, in such manner, as he shall find
 “ most proper and conducing to such a Peace.”
 (Enq. p. 337.)

So that here we have another Passage from Father *Leyburn*, as little to the *Enquirer's* Purpose as the former. It is here observable, that the Queen is so far from giving the least Countenance to *Glamorgan's* Transactions or the Pope's Peace, that she leaves the Negotiation of the whole Affair to the *Lord Lieutenant* ; and expressly says, that if her Instructions should interfere with any Letters sent him by the King, he should apply the Blanks to such Purposes as he should think proper, or most conducive to such a Peace, as the King had commissioned him to make with the *Irish*.

Let us now see, what Use the *Enquirer* has made of this Abstract from *Leyburn's Memoirs*. Here then he tells us, that *supposing Glamorgan's Commissions were only Blanks, signed and sealed*

sealed by the King, we may judge of the Nature and Force of them, by those which Father Leyburn received from the Queen and the Prince of Wales in 1644 to the Marquis of Ormond.

Never surely did a Critic and a Scholar take such Pains to expose himself and his Cause. What, are we to judge of the Nature and Force of *forged and false Commissions*, by the Nature and Force of *good ones*? of Blanks, which *Glamorgan* had no Authority to fill up in the manner he did; by those which the *Lord Lieutenant* was commissioned to fill up in such a manner as he should think proper?

How does the *Enquirer* get over this Difficulty; or what has he offered in Defence of such an idle absurd Position? Why, *Is* and *Suppositions* equally idle, absurd and groundless. *If*, says the *Enquirer*, *the Earl of Glamorgan received with his blank Commissions, such private Instructions, as the Lord Lieutenant received;*

If, as the Nuncio and the Bishop of Fernes assured Father Leyburn, his Lordship was ready to justify, that he had exactly followed his Instructions; and

If in Fact he did not appear in his Letters to the King, or others, or upon any other Occasion, conscious that he had in the least Circumstance acted against the trust reposed in him by his Majesty, then—What then? Why, “what
“ his Lordship did in Conformity to such secret
“ Instructions and Powers, was as much his
“ Majesty’s Act, as if himself had filled up his
“ Commissions, and not left them to be filled

“ up

“ up by his Lordship, as the Occasion should require.” (*Enq.* p. 338, 339.)

But if *Glamorgan* received no such Instructions from the *King*, as the Lord Lieutenant received;

If *Glamorgan* was not commissioned to fill up the *Blanks*, which were intrusted with him, in the Manner and to the Purposes, to which he applied them;

If the *Nuncio* and the Bishop of *Fernes* told Father *Leyburn* what was absolutely false, and what they could know nothing of, but from *Glamorgan*;

If these Particulars are certain, and have been clearly proved in the foregoing Observations, what does all this pompous Deduction of *Is*s and *Suppositions* amount to? Why,

That if *Glamorgan* did not forge his Commissions, he certainly did not forge them;

That if he had equal Powers granted him with the Lord Lieutenant, his Commissions were equally good; and what he did, was as much the King's Act, as if his Majesty had filled up his Commissions. Most profound Reasoning undoubtedly! What Rewards can be an adequate Encouragement to such noble Efforts in Search of Truth!

These are some of the Artifices, which the *Enquirer* has made use of, to asperse the Character of the Royal Martyr; and this is the admired Writer, who has thought himself of Consequence enough to attack the late learned

Mr.

Mr. *Carte*, and to charge him with Imperfections, Blunders, Misrepresentations, and what not?

A Word or two therefore in Vindication of a Person, who is not able to answer for himself, may not be improper: But at present I am heartily tired, and Decency obliges me to conclude that the Reader is so too. A Vindication of Mr. *Carte*, and some other Particulars, therefore must be reserved for an *Appendix* *. In the *Appendix* will be considered every material Exception to the Character and Conduct of King *Charles*, which has come to my Knowledge, and which could not properly be mentioned in the foregoing Pages. The laudable and peculiar *Design* of the *Enquiry*, and the wonderful Discoveries; the choice Collection of original Letters, lately published in the Second Edition of it; together with some Objections made to the Observation of the 30th of *January*, will be examined in a particular Manner. There is little Hopes to imagine, that Remarks of such an unpopular Nature should have any Weight with Readers who never determine to adhere to either Facts or Reasons, but such as coincide with their own Way of thinking. Great Prejudice is not uncommon amongst Writers who pretend to the greatest Impartiality, that they often take up with Notions too hastily, and talk themselves into a firm Belief of them, chiefly, *because they like them*. The Reasons why they like them, are obvious.

* This the Author's Death prevented from being finished.

The Influence of Education is admitted on all Hands: Most People by this Means are used to a peculiar Way of thinking: The Company they keep, generally think in the same Manner. In this Situation, instead of examining Things with an unprejudiced View, to come at Truth, every fresh Conversation serves to confirm them in their Mistakes. They are at length so habituated to their own Way of reasoning, that they are loth to quit it, even when they find it impossible to support it, but at the Expence of the most authentic Facts. Thus Prejudice becomes the Judge of Truth, and Popery itself, in the Point under Consideration, is absurdly made the Test of Protestantism! The most arrant Artifice of Popish Writers (which in any other Case would be despised or detested) being admitted as Evidence against King *Charles*, and urged as a Proof, that he was almost a Papist.

F I N I S.

The Influence of Education is admitted on all
 Hands: Most People by this Means are used to
 a peculiar Way of thinking: The Company
 they keep, generally remain in the same Manner
 in the same manner of thinking Things
 with an unimpaired Capacity of Truth,
 every man's Capacity of Truth is equal to his
 in their Minds: They are all equal to habi-
 tuate to their own way of thinking, that they
 are loth to quit it, even when they find it im-
 possible to support it, but at the Expense of the
 most authentic Facts. Thus Prejudice becomes
 the Judge of Truth, and Poverty itself in the
 Point under Consideration, is solemnly made
 the Test of Protestantism: The most ardent
 Adversaries of Popish Writers (which in any other
 Case would be despised or detested) being ad-
 mitted as Evidence against King-Charles, and
 urged as a Proof, that he was almost a Papist.

